
*Is There a "Subversive" Movement
In the Public Schools?*

The Documentation of
A Call to the Teachers of the Nation
To Reach for Power

Speech of
Hon. Paul W. Shafer
of Michigan
in the
House of Representatives
Friday, March 21, 1952

SPEECH
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN

MR. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the somewhat voluminous documentation which I am presenting here may be charged against a practice in which Congressmen—and perhaps even others—sometimes indulge. It is proof that a public speaker's departure from text can have unanticipated results.

This document might be described as the product of freedom rather than planning—in this instance, freedom of speech.

The whole thing started innocently enough. Its origins were entirely casual and unpremeditated.

The initial incident occurred during the recess of Congress, at a dinner meeting of a Republican club in my home State, although outside my own district, at which I was the guest speaker.

In the course of my address, and by way of elaborating a point which I do not now even recall, I mentioned that I had recently received an invitation from a superintendent of schools in my district to deliver a nonpolitical talk in the high school but that the invitation was subsequently withdrawn by a somewhat embarrassed superintendent who explained that there had been objections from school board members. In referring to this occurrence, I commented in my speech that the school board "evidently had knuckled under to the Democrats." I further remarked that it was not the only such experience I have had, and I added that invitations to Congressmen to make such nonpolitical talks in the schools had become rare although they were a commonplace in times past.

Subsequently I was queried by my hometown newspaper about these remarks. I repeated them and added the comment that there are "subversive activities and movements in some of the schools of the country and in some teachers' colleges."

The sequel of this incident and of the publicity given my remarks—with some

elaborations—by the Battle Creek newspaper, was the appearance of a newspaper article quoting anonymous spokesmen of teachers in the public schools of the Battle Creek area. These spokesmen denounced me for my comments and demanded that I either clarify and prove my charges or retract them. I was not, however, contacted directly by any representatives of the teachers at that time.

I immediately replied, through the press, calling attention to the anonymous character of this criticism and demand for retraction. While making clear that I had offered no blanket indictment of teachers and had not stated or implied that the canceled invitations to speak had occurred in the Battle Creek area, I did elaborate the subversive comment to the extent of stating the obvious truth that "an increasing number of Americans at the grass roots are concerned and disturbed over trends in educational philosophies and methods which run counter to the traditional American philosophy and principles of government."

The alleged spokesmen of the teachers thereafter made their identity known, and later the executive body of the Calhoun County branch of the Michigan Education Association adopted a resolution demanding that I prove or retract my charges.

Thereupon I invited representatives of the schools in Calhoun County to meet with me to discuss the matter. Some 60 individuals, including school superintendents, teachers, and school board members, attended. Also present was a representative of the Michigan Education Association, apparently on the invitation of the teachers' group.

The demands for proof or retraction of my charges were repeated at this meeting.

I stated that I saw no valid reason for precipitating a community controversy over the cancellation of my invitation to speak by identifying the school involved, especially since it was not located in the Battle Creek area and since my criticism, in that instance, had been directed at the school board and not at the superintendent or any teacher.

I repeated my disclaimer of "any intention of making a blanket criticism of the loyalty, conscientiousness, or good faith of members of the teaching profession." I pointed out that I had made no accusation against any individual teacher or specific school system in my district so far as my reference to subversive movements was concerned. I added, however, that I was fully aware of the fact—as they must also be—that "there are movements afoot in educational circles which are dedicated to the promotion through the schools of a system of planned and controlled economy and a system of world government to which national sovereignty in matters of national defense is to be subordinated."

I stated my conviction that there could be no question as to the right to discuss publicly the broad issues posed by this educational movement. I urged, however, that I not be required to extend that discussion or document the subject, under the circumstances, lest I appear to be making it a local issue or one based on personalities, to the detriment of the schools and the community.

Nevertheless, the demand was insistently repeated that I document the allegation, and I reluctantly agreed to do so.

Curiously, following the meeting, the two principal spokesmen for the teachers' group expressed the opinion that the matter could well be dropped. I reminded them that, at the insistence of several members of the group, I had promised, in the presence of some 60 persons, that I would provide the documentation. I added that I could not lightly break that promise.

Some weeks thereafter I received a letter from the two spokesmen repeating their insistent request for the documentation.

So far as I am concerned, there is no question as to the major issue upon which the insistence of the teachers' spokesmen is focused.

I am convinced that it is focused upon my reference to an educational movement which I labeled as "subversive."

Accordingly, I am not going to quibble over side issues.

The matter of the canceled invitations to speak is a matter of personal knowledge and first-hand experience which requires no proof or elaboration. Furthermore, it involves confidences that I will not violate.

As for the major item, the movement in public school circles which I described as "subversive," I welcome the demand that I document that subject.

As I will make abundantly clear, I make no blanket indictment of the schools or teaching profession, and I am engaged in no witchhunt.

Instead I am addressing myself to an existing educational movement which is closely identified with the program of the national "social planners"—a program which I believe bodes no good either for the schools or for the Nation.

I use the term "subversive" in the connotation of "undermining allegiance and faith." I use the term in the sense in which I assume that it was used by Dean Henry W. Holmes of the graduate school of education of Harvard University when he cautioned that "Teachers must see that their teaching is neither subversive nor reactionary"—Progressive Education, October 1933, pages 414-418.

I am certainly realistic enough to recognize that America is not perfect—neither is its government, nor its economic system, nor its social arrangements. But I believe that it is still "the last best hope of earth."

America is not perfect—but I believe that an educational movement and philosophy which "accentuates the negative," which minimizes, ignores or denies the strengths, accomplishments and potentialities of our Government, our economic system and our social arrangements, is subversive.

I believe that an educational movement and philosophy which minimizes or denies the potentialities of individual and collective self-improvement of the American people and American institutions, save through the expanding agencies of government, is subversive.

I believe that an educational movement and philosophy which pits class against class in America, which attributes only evil and viciousness to one class or group of citizens and only virtue to another class or group, and which proposes that the schools teach and promote such a belief and attitude, is subversive.

I believe that an educational movement and philosophy which brands the capitalist or owner as the inevitable and implacable foe of human rights, as incapable of social conscience or responsibility, and as hostile to improvement or

opportunities for improvement for his fellow men, is subversive.

I believe that an educational movement and philosophy which insists and would teach in the public school classroom that the only solution—and the desirable solution—of the problems of Americans, of the problems of self-government, economics and social well-being, lies in increasingly bigger government, in increasing concentration of power in centralized government, is subversive.

I believe that an educational movement and philosophy which proposes to convert the public schools into an agency for the promotion of socialism, a planned collectivist economy, government regimentation or the welfare state, is subversive.

I believe that an educational movement and philosophy which arrogates to the educational profession—or which undertakes to assign to any other profession or segment of the national life—the awful responsibility of “social reconstruction,” is subversive.

I believe that an educational movement which urges the teachers or any other single group in the national life “to reach for power and then make the most of its conquest,” and which claims for any single group a freedom from accountability to the public and an immunity from public criticism, is subversive.

I believe that an educational movement and philosophy which proposes to convert the public schools into an agency for the promotion of supernational sovereignty or world government and which urges the systematic eradication—beginning in the kindergarten—of nationalism, and which decrees that nationalism and the loyalties which it involves must go, is subversive.

I believe that an educational movement and philosophy which, in the name of so-called progressive education and academic freedom, attributes supreme virtue to the new, to the attitude of critical skepticism, to cynical distrust of human motives and impulses, and which, at the same time, belittles the old, decries inherited loyalties, and minimizes truths and values established by past experience, is subversive.

In all of this I am expressing my own opinion and judgment.

But in the material which follows I am not presenting personal opinion. I am documenting a movement in public-school education from the record and testimony of its own leaders and adherents.

I. A STATEMENT OF THE SUBJECT UNDER DISCUSSION

This is a documentation of a movement and a trend in present-day public-school education in the United States.

Basically, the fact here documented is that a significantly influential segment of public-school leadership in the United States proclaims—as it has been proclaiming for some 20 years—the right and duty of teachers, school administrators, and educational leaders to undertake to remake American society and government through the agency and medium of the public schools.

This movement and trend have found, and continue to find, advocacy, expression and implementation through the policy pronouncements of educational organizations, through professional books and journals, through the counsel and instruction of teachers of teachers in colleges of education and at educational conferences and workshops, and through the activities of disciples of the movement in developing curricular content and classroom procedures in elementary and secondary public schools.

I have used the two terms “movement” and “trend” advisedly, although I will use the single term “movement” hereafter for brevity. What is here described is a movement, since it involves planned and organized activities directed to specific ends; it is also a trend, in the sense that the effects and influence of the movement extend beyond specific, organized, and planned activities.

Certain basic premises characterize this movement:

First. It proclaims that capitalism in the United States is doomed—that it is dead, or dying—and that its replacement by some form of collectivism, by some form or degree of planned economy, government control, or outright socialization, essentially new and different in character, is both desirable and inevitable.

Second. This movement and its sponsors hold that the schools should participate actively in building a new social order along these collectivist lines,

that this activity should be carried on either through outright indoctrination of these premises and concepts or through processes of guided group study and discussion and uncoerced persuasion within the classroom, and that the schools, through both the content and methods of instruction, should prepare and condition the child for participation in that new social order.

Third. The movement calls for such revision of the educational system, and of its philosophy, procedures, and subject matter, as is necessary to advance and accomplish these purposes.

Fourth. More extreme educational sponsors of this movement also hold that the transition to collectivism will, in all probability, involve class conflict; that the schools, accordingly, should adopt the class approach in their educational activities, align themselves with the worker class, and utilize class consciousness and conflict as a "potential resource."

Fifth. Advocates of the program of social reconstruction through the schools recognize the inevitability of opposition to that program and accordingly propose certain "steps to power" designed to enable the schools and the profession to deal, both offensively and defensively, with the anticipated resistance.

Sixth. The movement also includes advocacy of a variety of other subsidiary proposals for changes in the form, philosophy, and procedures of government in the United States.

Seventh. Since teachers are envisioned by this movement as "engineers of social change," the political-economic-social views of teachers become a matter of vital concern to advocates of social reconstruction through the schools.

Eighth. Since the Second World War, the program of social reconstruction through the schools has received significant restatement in a formally adopted program of the progressive education organization.

Ninth. A further postwar development in the movement has been the addition of the goal of world government and a supernational sovereignty to the program of social reconstruction through the schools.

These are the main features, the principal tenets, of the movement here being described, and the foregoing summary

constitutes a brief outline of the material documented herein.

There should be further preliminary understandings with respect to this documentation.

I make no claim that it is complete or exhaustive. The source material itself is too voluminous even for complete perusal; moreover, constant additions are being made to the literature of the movement. I do claim, however, that the documentation offered is fairly typical and representative of the basic premises and objectives of the movement as stated by its own advocates and adherents.

I have attempted to identify my sources with painstaking care. A partial bibliography of the movement is appended to this document. I have also attempted to indicate accurately the official educational position held by the professional leaders quoted and the exact professional status of any educational organizations referred to.

I have made no attempt to estimate or compute, on any statistical basis, the extent of the acceptance of the tenets of this movement among members of the teaching and school administration professions. I do not know of any information available in this form. In any event the influence of such a movement can scarcely be gauged in such terms. Later I will have occasion to cite certain estimates of the influence of the progressive education movement, offered by its own spokesmen, including a statement of the peak membership of the organization. In another instance, I will cite the tabulations of a survey of teacher sentiment on political-economic-social issues, polled by leaders of the movement here documented. But that is the extent of my statistical information.

I make no attempt to single out individual teachers or specific school systems which may be adherents of this movement. I do not have access to such information and I am engaged in no such enterprise. Responsibility for alertness to this movement, at the local level and in specific school systems, rests with local boards of education, parent-teacher and other community groups, and with all interested parents and citizens.

If this documentation adds to the general knowledge and understanding of the movement and increases public aware-

ness of need for local vigilance, it will serve its purpose.

I wish particularly to emphasize that I am not indulging, and have never indulged, in any blanket indictment of the public-school system or of the teaching profession. I will have more to say on that point a little later.

By the way of summing up the basic facts which are the subject of this documentation, I cite a statement made by the late Dr. William H. Kilpatrick, long professor of education at Teachers College, Columbia University, a gentleman who was by no means hostile to the movement here being documented. Speaking at a meeting of the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association—now the American Association of School Administrators—on February 27, 1935, Dr. Kilpatrick said with respect to members of the profession:

There are many who think that our social-economic system should be radically reconstructed. To this proposal, opinion responds over a wide range from an extreme yes to an extreme no, with all gradations in between. Some who are most anxious to bring about this social-economic reconstruction urge the school to take an active part in helping to build the new social order. To this proposal also, opinion responds over a wide range from an extreme yes through intermediate positions to an extreme no. (NEA Proceedings, 1935, p. 567.)

This documentation is concerned with the segment of the profession falling in the area "left of center"—veering in the direction of what Dr. Kilpatrick called the "extreme yes" with respect to the two propositions he mentioned. More specifically, this documentation is concerned with the organized, vocal and aggressive element of the educational profession dedicated to the support of the social reconstruction through the schools movement.

II. THE SMEAR CHARGE

No responsible American would wish to place the public school system or the teaching profession generally under a cloud of suspicion.

Unfortunately there are those who are willing to take advantage of that very fact in order to forestall legitimate criticism or exposure of abuses.

There are those who instantly respond to a discussion and documentation of the type here being undertaken with the cry of "Smear."

The ultimate effect of cowering before that outcry would, of course, be to estop all necessary and proper criticism.

If this documentation does result in misgivings with respect to the public schools and the teaching profession, the responsibility for those misgivings must rest upon the movement being documented, not upon the documentation.

Indeed, as I see it, one of the potential values of this documentation is that it defines—or at least undertakes, in good faith, to define—the particular movement under discussion with sufficient objectivity and accuracy that the interested American will be able clearly to distinguish between those who are advocates or adherents of the movement, and those who are not. That, certainly, is the complete opposite of a blanket indictment or an indiscriminate smear.

It is regrettable that there is currently prevalent an official and widely expressed attitude among many leaders of public school education which adds to public confusion and misunderstanding and so tends to cast an unmerited shadow of suspicion upon the public schools and the teaching profession. I believe it is important to call attention to this attitude before moving into my actual documentation.

I refer to the attitude of hypersensitivity, resentment and hostility to criticism of the schools verging upon a persecution complex, which has even produced a blanket denunciation of critics of the schools as "the enemy."

It is not an exaggeration to say that educational officialdom has declared an open season on critics of the schools.

Typical of the official pronouncements on this score is a resolution adopted by the Michigan Education Association on August 25, 1951, condemning "the irresponsible attacks which are now being made on our schools, their personnel and procedures, attacks which often are designed to discredit the public schools, reduce their financial support, curtail their program, and destroy free public education for all children." The MEA pledged its resources "to expose and combat" these "vicious attacks."

The National Education Association at its San Francisco convention, July 6, 1951, adopted a resolution asserting that—

The NEA believes that one of the year's most challenging problems is presented by attacks of front organizations and pressure

groups on the public schools, on their teachers and administrators, and on the quality of instruction. The Association believes in and welcomes honest and constructive criticism but condemns general and irresponsible attacks on schools. Often the real purpose of such attacks is found to be the reduction of school costs and the curtailment of the public school program. (NEA Journal, September 1951, p. 383.)

The Thirtieth yearbook of the American Association of School Administrators, entitled "The American School Superintendency," devotes several paragraphs to the subject "Attacks on the Schools." It quotes an article by Arthur D. Morse in McCall's magazine—September 1951—to the effect that—

Public education in America is under the heaviest attack in its history. This attack is not aimed at the improvement of free education. It is aimed at its destruction.

The yearbook charges:

In some cases this pressure may be sparked by organizations or individuals who are authoritarian in intent, seeking to destroy the American way of life by undermining public confidence in the schools. They are persistent, devious, and clever in the way they twist statements and acts of educational leaders and by innuendo and association create doubt of the motives and methods of the entire public-school system (p. 238).

One current interpretation of criticisms of the public schools is that these attacks are the result of "a central command," and that they emanate from persons "who have no competence to judge educational matters"—Fact Sheet, Community Relations Service of New York City, March 1, 1951. This same publication cites as proof of the "central command" the fact that there have been flare-ups in widely separated communities. My own home city of Battle Creek, Mich., is listed as the scene of one such flare-up, despite the fact that within the last 2 or 3 years its citizens, with the active support of the real estate and property owner groups, voted a million and a quarter dollars in extra tax funds for needed school rehabilitation and despite the fact that my home city was cited by the superintendent of schools in a national educational magazine as a model of public cooperation in support of the schools.

The same charge of a planned attack on the schools is made by David Hulburd in his book, *This Happened in Pasadena*, 1951:

It is a fact that certain forces, vicious, well organized, and coldly calculating, would like to change the face of education in the United States (p. ix).

Perhaps the most shocking manifestation of the "persecution complex" was the official report on the Pasadena school controversy made to the National Education Association at its San Francisco meeting last July. In this report—Bulletin No. 35, National Commission for the Defense of Democracy through Education of the NEA—the commission chairman, Harold Benjamin, branded the opposition to the Pasadena superintendent as "The Enemy" and proceeded to describe the stereotype "Enemy" of the public schools.

The consequences of this defensive attitude toward criticism are extremely serious so far as the public relations of the schools are concerned. Any individual who ventures a criticism of the schools finds that he has spoken at his own peril and that he has thereby incurred the wrath of a powerfully organized pressure group. Even elected public school officials—school board members—discover that they are not immune from organized retaliatory pressure measures.

The impression created by this hypersensitivity to criticism is that those in educational circles demand a double standard of freedom. They seem to insist upon virtually absolute academic freedom for themselves. At the same time, they insist that criticism of the schools by the public must be restricted to what they designate as constructive—and therefore permissible.

The situation has an ironical aspect. Criticism of the public schools is not a new phenomenon. Indeed, one of the most prolific sources of criticism of the schools over the past three decades has been the very movement here being documented. This criticism has come both from within the profession and from lay supporters of the movement. Yet this criticism has brought no answering denunciations from educational officialdom, no labeling of the critics as "The Enemy," no accusations of a plot "under central command" to destroy the schools. Instead, spokesmen of this movement have often been welcome speakers at educational conferences, applauded to an echo for their attacks on the schools.

Leaders in this movement have repeatedly insisted—and continue to in-

sist—that the schools are “in need of thorough reconstruction.” They have charged that “educational leadership has too much interest in the matter of pleasing boards of education.” They have accused the schools of furthering social chaos. They have alleged that “after 150 years, American education has left us as vicious socially and as dishonest as we were before that education began.” They have denounced “the commonplaces of American education” as “faint voices from a distant and mythical land” when compared with the social and educational developments in Soviet Russia in the 1930’s.

A spokesman for this movement branded a report of an NEA commission as “full of pompous idealistic expressions and threadbare axioms—a shallow and spineless analysis.”

There have been bold pronouncements that “the public generally has registered its loss of faith in its educational system,” and that education “must clean house of a multitude of rubbish.” Teachers have been told, by leaders of this movement, that they must emancipate themselves from the domination of the business interests and that they must “cease cultivating the manners and associations of bankers.” That last, by the way, was written back in the days when there was no more fighting word than “banker.”

Teachers have been told that they must “abandon smug middle-class tradition”—a somewhat unkind and sweeping generalization about the so-called middle class. Teachers have also been warned that they would have “to restate their philosophy of education, reorganize the procedures of the schools, and even redefine their own position in society.” Talk about blanket indictments.

These are typical of the attacks upon the public schools and the teaching profession which have emanated—and still emanate—from the progressive education movement. And the Progressive Education Association has not been bashful in its claims as to the accomplishments and influence of the movement and its attacks.

Vinal H. Tibbets, director of the Progressive Education Association, declared in 1945, that “the impact”—of the association—“upon educational thinking and practice is immeasurable.” He further

commented that the association’s largest annual membership was under 11,000, and that “probably no group so small, except the early Christians, has ever made such progress in so short a time in changing the direction of a social movement”—*Progressive Education* magazine, March 1945, page 3.

That the attacks upon school and teacher philosophy and practices have been intense is further attested by the comments of a letter, appearing in the same issue of the magazine, from Dr. Virgil M. Rogers, superintendent of schools of Battle Creek, Mich., then a vice president of the Progressive Education Association and now president of the American Association of School Administrators. Dr. Rogers wrote:

Some of us who have been associated with the Progressive Education Association * * * for many years, rejoice in the fact that we have been able to maintain a good magazine in spite of the depression years, and notwithstanding the terrific battles which progressive education has had to fight during these recent years of reaction to modern education.

I especially like the friendly and forthright fashion in which news articles deal with serious conflicts in American education (p. 2, *ibid*).

Since public school education—including progressive education—has obviously flourished heretofore on criticism and conflict, it is passing strange that criticism now suddenly becomes the mark of “the enemy.” Of course, human experience records that there have been other instances in which former heretics, having achieved power and the status of orthodoxy, proceed to denounce the new generation of dissenters.

III. SKELETON IN THE CLOSET

The sensitivity of educational officialdom to criticism is particularly acute with respect to any charge or suggestion that collectivism or socialism is being fostered in the public schools. The official reaction to such an accusation is an air of injured and indignant innocence.

Since the phrase “socialism in the schools” is a man-in-the-street version of the movement here under discussion, it becomes relevant to this documentation to record some of the official denials of this allegation.

I quote, first of all, from a monthly bulletin issued by Superintendent C. C. Trillingham of the Los Angeles County, Calif., public schools. This bulletin was

published in the October 1950 Education Digest, page 39:

Anyone who knows about the general educational program of the schools today knows that the charges that the schools are leading the country toward socialism, that the fundamental skills are being ignored, and that there is no attempt to discipline youngsters, are untrue. That these are the results of a premeditated program of so-called "progressive education" is sheer nonsense.

In the report on the recent Pasadena, Calif., school controversy, entitled "The Pasadena Story," issued by the National Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education of the NEA—of which commission Superintendent Virgil M. Rogers, of Battle Creek, Mich., was a member at the time—attention is called to "certain general charges" made by groups critical of the schools:

They apparently claim that this country has already moved into, or is rapidly moving toward, some form of socialism, collectivism, or statism. They contend that subversive elements have sifted into public education and that many teachers are seeking to change the American way of life. They charge that John Dewey's progressive education is an instrument designed to break down American standards and weaken the fabric of American society. They oppose Federal aid to education on the ground that it is a collectivist measure. They oppose certain educators who they assert are seeking to indoctrinate the youth of the country for a changed social and economic order (p. 23).

Commenting on this summation of charges, the Commission's report says:

Many explanations could be given for these criticisms. Probably the most general one is the wave of reaction which has swept over this country as the result of the fear of communism (p. 22).

Similarly, the Defense Bulletin issued by Harold Benjamin, chairman of this NEA commission, and previously cited, refers to these allegations in a sarcastic vein. In his description of the so-called "Enemy" and his tactics, Mr. Benjamin says:

He has whipped up pseudo-popular revolts there (in Pasadena) against teachers, administrators and school programs on the grounds that they are indoctrinating the children in communism, socialism, or at least mentioning democracy, and they are helping to increase taxes.

Dean Ernest O. Melby of the New York University School of Education, writing in the pamphlet, "American Education

Under Fire," 1951, explains that such accusations may arise from a misunderstanding:

Often * * * when schools deal with controversial issues they are accused of communism or leftist leanings merely because various viewpoints are presented and arguments are carried on with regard to the various issues (p. 32).

This same "explanation" is elaborated by Dean Melby in an article in the October 1951 NEA Journal—pages 441-442—in which he says that "most of the attacks being made on public education are dishonest and unjustified":

Schools must deal with controversial issues. In doing so they are sometimes accused of leftist leanings by persons who fail to realize that teaching about communism is not the same thing as teaching communism. What the schools are trying to do is to equip boys and girls to deal with the present ideological conflict successfully.

Dean J. B. Edmondson of the University of Michigan School of Education was even more emphatic in an article in the September 1951 NEA Journal—pages 381-382. Writing on "the threats to public education," Dean Edmondson listed as one of these "threats":

The insidious efforts of some persons to create the false impression that teachers are committed to a "progressive philosophy of education" that is socialistic and communistic in its influence on children and youth.

As a final example, I quote a newspaper report of an address in February 1952, before the Battle Creek (Mich.) Exchange Club by Supt. Virgil M. Rogers:

"Economic education has become a necessity today, where once the American way of life was looked upon as a subject everyone knew about," Dr. Rogers said. "Not until this generation have the free-enterprise system and the democratic way of life been seriously challenged by socialism and communism and this creates a difficult situation for teachers," Dr. Rogers said.

"In order for boys and girls to know what it is that imperils our way of life, it is necessary to teach about communism and socialism," said Dr. Rogers, emphasizing the word "about."

He said the teachers "teach about these other forms of government carefully, always pointing out the dangers to our way of life."

If I am capable of understanding the English language as used by the educators in the foregoing statements, those statements are a categorical denial of the existence of the movement and trend here being documented. In view of the

record which this documentation clearly establishes, this denial is inexplicable. It means to me that educators who speak and write in this vein are less than frank with the American people. They are hiding a skeleton in the closet. The effect of these denials can only be to create confusion, misunderstanding and the very attitude of suspicion which they profess to be so anxious to avoid.

In the documentation that follows, there will be abundant evidence that advocacy of socialism is one item of belief identified with the movement under discussion. Even more to the point is the fact that the movement calls for the remaking of our society by and through the schools, and that it claims the right and duty of the teacher to engage in that enterprise in the classroom under the guise of academic freedom.

IV. MEET DR. COUNTS

Some 4 or 5 years after his appointment as a professor of education at Teachers College, Columbia University, Dr. George S. Counts read a paper before a conference of the Progressive Education Association in Baltimore, Md., in February 1932.

This paper, bearing the title "Dare Progressive Education Be Progressive?" proved to be an epochal event in the history of modern American education. It is also the necessary starting point in the documentation which I am here undertaking.

Because of the major—even dominant—role which Dr. Counts played in the early history of the movement under discussion, it is important to become somewhat acquainted with him and his views. In doing so, I am not indulging in personalities or undertaking to cast Dr. Counts in a villain's role. And my interest in Dr. Counts' relationship to the movement being described here is not limited to its origins.

If I am any judge of the record, Dr. Counts is an educator who has himself gained considerable education in the past 20 years. Indeed I am convinced that he is today a wiser and possibly sadder man than the 43-year-old Columbia professor who issued the ringing summons to social reconstruction through the classroom in his paper before the Baltimore meeting. I believe he is not only a man with the courage of his convictions and the courage to change his convictions in the light of

experience and reflection, but also a man who has demonstrated real physical courage by carrying his convictions into the enemy's camp with brave defiance—the enemy's camp being a Communist-sponsored "international cultural" gathering held in New York City in 1949.

Dr. Counts' dominant leadership in the launching of the social reconstruction movement is attested not only by the Baltimore address but by his authorship of the monograph, "Dare the School Build a New Social Order?" in 1932; his chairmanship of the Progressive Education Association committee on social and economic problems which issued the 1933 Call to the Teachers of the Nation; his service as research director of the American Historical Association Commission on Social Studies, and his editorship, for several years, of the *Social Frontier*, official journal of the movement.

It contributes to an understanding of the background of Dr. Counts' paper before the Baltimore meeting of the Progressive Education Association to know that at the time he was an enthusiastic observer and commentator on the "great collectivist experiment" in Soviet Russia. He was one of several American educators who, in keeping with the custom of the times—a custom encouraged by the Communist organization in the United States—had made several pilgrimages to Russia to view first hand, under proper chaperonage, the workings of that experiment. In 1931 Dr. Counts wrote a book entitled "The Soviet Challenge to America."

His estimate of the importance of the collectivist experiment in Russia is expressed in this statement:

The world today is full of social experimentation. There is one experiment, however, that dwarfs all others—so bold indeed in its ideals and its program that few can contemplate it without emotion. Because of the clouds of passion which still envelop it, there is serious danger that its most revolutionary, though least sensational, features may escape adequate notice. Soviet Russia is endeavoring with all the resources at her command to bring the economic order under a measure of rational control. She may fail in the attempt, but in the meantime every student of human affairs should follow the effort with breathless interest. She issues to the Western nations and particularly to the United States a challenge—perhaps one of the greatest challenges of history. But she issues it not through the Communist Inter-

national, nor through the Red Army, nor through the Gay-Pay-OO (political police), as most of our citizens naively and timorously believe, but through her State Planning Commission and her system of public education. (*The Soviet Challenge to America*, pp. ix-x, foreword.)

Dr. Counts drew a contrast between Soviet Russia's approach to economic problems and that of the United States which left no doubt as to where, in theory at least, his sympathies and inclinations lay. He wrote:

In the societies of the West in general and the United States of America in particular the evolution of institutions proceeds for the most part without plan or design, as a sort of byproduct of the selfish competition of individuals, groups and enterprises for private gain. In Russia, on the other hand, since the days of 1917, the Soviet government has sought to promote the rational and orderly development of the entire social economy. * * * In the great 5-year plan of construction, which was launched in October of 1928 * * * a whole civilization is harnessing its energies and is on the march toward consciously determined goals (*ibid.*, p. 7).

He said further:

If the revolution is successful the social order which is emerging today in Soviet Russia will first of all be collectivistic. In its essence this means that the institution of private property, at least insofar as it applies to land and the tools of production, will be abolished. It also means that no individual will be able to acquire great wealth, that the motive of personal gain will cease to drive the wheels of the economic order, that the senseless competition in the conspicuous consumption of goods will come to an end, and that land, railroads, factories, mills, shops, houses, and natural resources will be owned collectively and administered in the interests of all (pp. 24-25).

There are further comparisons drawn, again by no means favorable, in Dr. Count's judgment, to the American system:

No sensitive mind can remain long in the Soviet Union without feeling himself in a veritable furnace of the world where the elements composing human society are in a state of fusion and new principles of right and wrong are being forged. Under such conditions the commonplaces of American education sound like faint voices from a distant and mythical land (p. 324).

And again:

The revolutionary movement embraces much that is rich and challenging in the best sense of the word. The idea of building a new society along the lines developed by the Communists should provide a genu-

ine stimulus to the mind and liberate the energies of millions. It is certainly no worse than the drive towards individual success which permeates not only the schools but every department of culture in the United States. If one were to compare the disciplined effort of the Soviet to industrialize the country, to socialize agriculture, to abolish poverty, to banish disease, to liquidate unemployment, to disseminate knowledge, and generally to raise the material and spiritual level of the masses, with the selfish scramble for wealth and privilege, the cruel disregard of the less sensational forms of human suffering, the relative absence of a sense of social responsibility, the reluctance to come honestly to grips with the major problems of the time, and the apparent decay of the political, ethical, and religious life in America, one would find small grounds for complacency. Whatever may be said on the other side concerning the regimentation of opinion and the restriction of individual freedom, there exists in Soviet Russia today an idealism and a driving passion for human betterment which contrast strangely with the widespread cynicism of the United States. It is only natural that this idealism and this passion should sweep through the schools as well as through the rest of the social order (pp. 328-330).

Finally, consider these rhapsodical lines with which Dr. Counts closes his book:

This cultural revolution possesses a single mighty integrating principle—the building of a new society in which there will be neither rich nor poor, in which the mainspring of all industry will be social rather than private profit, in which no man will be permitted to exploit another by reason of wealth or social position, in which the curse of Eden will be lifted forever from the soul of woman, in which a condition of essential equality will unite all races and nations into one brotherhood. Although the cultural applications of this principle often assume crude and exaggerated forms, as in the case of the Proletcult and the censorship of art, it is nevertheless authentic and vital. There is consequently in the Soviet Union today a sensitiveness to the more fundamental human wrongs and a passion for social justice that simply cannot be matched in any other quarter of the globe. A devotion to the common good and a deep interest in the oppressed of all lands penetrate and color every aspect of the cultural life of the country. That the pursuit of the goal may often be blind and unintelligent during the current period of stress and experimentation is only to be expected. The school, the press, the theater, the cinema, and life generally in Russia are full of excesses and imbecilities and of sound conceptions poorly executed. But back of it all, even the excesses and the imbecilities, there stands a great and challenging ideal which the rest of the world

cannot continue to ignore and which may in time serve to bring art, science, and philosophy into essential harmony. In the meantime the leaders in American industry, politics, and thought, instead of dissipating their energies in the futile attempt to erect barriers against the spread of Communist doctrines, would do well to fashion an alternative program of equal boldness and honesty to discipline the energies and humanize the spirit of industrial civilization (pp. 338-339).

Let me interject at this point in the interests of complete fairness and accuracy that 20 years later—and 20 years wiser and sadder—Dr. Counts recorded a much more sober judgment with respect to Soviet Russia. Writing in the January 1951 National Education Association Journal, Dr. Counts said:

The Soviet leaders boast every hour of the day about their grandiose achievements in economy and government, war and revolution, science, art, and culture. While some of these claims are justified, others are dubious, to say the least. Yet they have to their credit one truly staggering achievement about which they say nothing—their all-embracing system of mind control. * * *

The Soviet system of mind control is the product of perverted genius. It is the most comprehensive thing of its kind in history, surpassing immeasurably its predecessor under the Tsar. * * * Employing with complete ruthlessness and singleness of purpose all the resources of science, of mechanical invention, of medicine and psychology, it is able to attain power and reach heights of efficiency which dwarf the efforts of earlier despotisms.

The system embraces all of the organized processes and agencies for the molding of the minds of both young and old.

Pointing out that during the closing months of the Second World War the high command of the Communist Party in Russia “decided to reverse completely the war-time policy of friendly collaboration with the western democracies and to revive the policy of revolutionary aggression in the spirit of 1917,” Dr. Counts goes on to observe, with obvious sorrow:

The reason for this tragic action * * * is not difficult to discern. But in order to know the truth we must renounce all wishful thinking and face the fully authenticated reality—the ultimate goal of the Soviet high command has not changed since the revolution and probably will not change for many years.

That goal is the overthrow at all costs, and by all means available, of the entire “capitalist,” “bourgeois,” or non-Soviet world. (Mind Control in the Soviet Union, pp. 29-32, NEA Journal, January 1951.)

While Dr. Counts as recently at least as 1945 had by no means abandoned his concept of the desirability of “general economic planning” in the United States, there are noteworthy modifications in his view of the American economic system and of the role of the school in reconstructing that system. Writing in “Education and the Promise of America,” he said:

The young * * * should study critically the values and weaknesses of the “system of free enterprise,” the dangers and possibilities in collective action (pp. 127-128).

As we will have occasion to see, Dr. Counts had come a long way from his 1932 views when he acknowledged, in this 1945 statement, that there are values in the system of free enterprise, and dangers in a system of collective action.

Something of the same eye-opening and disillusioning experience which Dr. Counts had with respect to the Soviet Utopia was repeated insofar as the American brand of Communists were concerned. After a bitter experience with Communist Party units of Teachers College, Columbia University, Dr. Counts wrote as follows regarding Communist tactics—The Social Frontier, February 1939, pages 135-140:

Seemingly even the editors of the Social Frontier live and learn.

A concluding word on the broader significance and implications of the story here unfolded may not be inappropriate. * * * Those who resort to the tactics and strategy reflected in that story should know that they are playing with fire. They profess to be fighting the growth of fascism in America and the world. Yet they indulge lightly in irresponsible provocation, vilification of character, and distortion of history. They appear to operate on the principle that they will destroy by any means at hand whatever they cannot rule. Thus, by a strange dialectical process, they serve as a midwife of fascism; they prepare the very food on which fascism feeds. With my own eyes I have seen them create Fascist attitudes at Teachers College. They profess to be defending democracy against reaction and preach the united front of all popular forces. Yet they proceed to violate the most elementary democratic virtues of fairness and integrity, and by their methods bring inevitable discord into the ranks of the popular cause. They meet fundamental criticism with the cry of “red baiting,” and then reserve to themselves all the other colors of the rainbow.

One lesson contemporary history teaches with unmistakable clarity—ends and means cannot be separated—undemocratic means destroy democratic ends. Such means if long

continued and widely practiced may bring twilight both to Teachers College and to American democracy.

Two years later Dr. Counts wrote:

The Communist Party, as an instrument of popular advance, must be completely repudiated. My experience convinces me that it poisons everything that it touches. * * * Democracy must stand on its own feet and formulate its own program for dealing with the problems arising out of a world in revolution. (*Frontiers of Democracy*, May 15, 1941, pp. 231-232.)

Truly, Dr. Counts had lived and learned.

One more reference to the metamorphosis of Dr. Counts:

Following publication of his monograph, "Dare the School Build a New Social Order?" in 1932, a review was published in the *Progressive Education* magazine—February 1933, page 71 and following pages—written by J. I. Zilberfarb, a member of the State Scientific Council at the Commissariat of Education of the Russian Republic. In a letter accompanying this review, Zilberfarb expressed his pleasure to Dr. Counts at "the remarkable progress which you have made in challenging capitalism." In the review he expressed the belief that Dr. Counts "continues to make great strides ahead" and added the hope that he would come to take "a firm stand on dialectic materialism" which will bring him to "socialism, communism." Clearly he saw in Dr. Counts the makings of a true comrade.

Sixteen years later, the *Daily Worker*—March 28, 1949—denounced Counts, along with several others, as "a vociferous group of Trotskyites and other anti-Communists." Occasion of this blast was Dr. Counts' uninvited appearance at the Communist-sponsored International Cultural and Scientific Conference in New York City late in March 1949. Dr. Counts had invaded the meeting to challenge Communist delegates to account for the disappearance in Russia of several scholars who had displeased the Stalin regime. And, as a further offense, Dr. Counts was one of the sponsors of a rival mass meeting held at the time of the Communist-sponsored conclave.

Incidentally, one of the invited and warmly applauded speakers at the International Cultural and Scientific Conference was John J. DeBoer, professor of education at the University of Illinois

and a former president of the Progressive Education Association. And a co-sponsor of the conference was Dr. Theodore Brameld, professor of education of New York University, who served as vice president and board member of the Progressive Education Association at the time Dr. Virgil M. Rogers, of Battle Creek, held the same offices.

Obviously Dr. Counts has gained wisdom with the years, as has many another well-intentioned and overzealous "liberal" who once hailed the Soviet collectivist experiment as the hope of humanity. I have recorded that change of attitude in the interests of complete accuracy and fairness.

This change of attitude, on the part of Dr. Counts, is only incidental, however, to the social reconstruction through the schools movement which he pioneered. That movement, as we shall see, persists to this day. And there likewise persist the collectivist and socialistic premises which characterized that movement from the outset.

V. "CAPITALISM IS DEAD; LONG LIVE COLLECTIVISM"

The fundamental premise of the movement which I am here documenting is stated categorically and with almost monotonous repetition in the literature of that movement.

That premise is that capitalism is doomed—that it is dead, or dying—and that its replacement by some form of collectivism, by some form or degree of planned economy, governmental control or socialization, essentially new and different in character, is both desirable and inevitable.

Whatever later modifications and qualifications of this premise we may encounter, and whatever the euphemisms in which the theories and proposals may later be expressed, they must still be appraised in the light of this original premise. For it was this premise which gave birth to, and still gives vital impulse to, the movement here under discussion.

This premise is stated by Dr. Counts in his original paper delivered before the Baltimore Progressive Education Association meeting:

We live in troublous times; we live in an age of profound change; we live in an age of revolution. (*Dare Progressive Education Be Progressive?*, *Progressive Education* magazine, April 1932, p. 261.)

A new world is forming, he asserted, a world in which economic issues will be fundamental and "the center of bitter and prolonged struggle." Citing the evils, abuses and contradictions in the economic situation disclosed by the depression, then at its worst, Dr. Counts expressed the belief that nonetheless "we hold within our hands the power to usher in an age of plenty, to make secure the lives of all, and to banish poverty forever from the land." But—

The achievement of this goal * * * would seem to require fundamental changes in the economic system. Historic capitalism, with its deification of the principle of selfishness, its reliance upon the forces of competition, its placing of property above human rights, and its exaltation of the profit motive, will either have to be displaced altogether, or so radically changed in form and spirit that its identity will be completely lost (ibid. pp. 261-262).

Dr. Counts makes very clear what this involves. In his own words, it means development of "a coordinated, planned, and socialized economy."

To those who may see a threat to freedom in such a program he addresses these remarks:

That under such an economy the actions of individuals in certain directions would be limited is fairly obvious. No one would be permitted to build a new factory or railroad whenever or wherever he please; also, no one would be permitted to amass great riches by manipulating the economic institutions of the country. On the other hand, by means of the complete and uninterrupted functioning of the economic system the foundations would be laid for a measure of freedom in the realm of personal life that mankind has never known in the past. Freedom without a secure economic base is simply no freedom at all. Thus, in comparison with the right to work and eat, the right to vote is but an empty bauble (ibid., pp. 261-262).

It is noteworthy that in this superficial line of thinking, government prohibition of the freedom to start a legitimate business is classed in the same category as government prohibition of obviously improper speculation and financial manipulation. It is also noteworthy that there is no recognition here that "the right to work and eat" can readily be forfeited with the loss of the "empty bauble"—the right to vote.

In his monograph, "Dare the School Build a New Social Order?" which combined his Baltimore address with two

other papers, Dr. Counts is even more explicit in his diagnosis and prescription:

If we accept industrialism, as we must, we are then compelled to face without equivocation the most profound issue which this new order of society has raised and settle that issue in terms of the genius of our people—the issue of the control of the machine.

* * * If the machine is to serve all, and serve all equally, it cannot be the property of the few * * *.

If democracy is to survive, it must seek a new economic foundation. * * * If property rights are to be diffused in industrial society, natural resources and all important forms of capital will have to be collectively owned. Obviously, every citizen cannot hold title to a mine, a factory, a railroad, a department store, or even a thoroughly mechanized farm. This means that, if democracy is to survive in the United States, it must abandon its individualistic affiliations in the sphere of economics (pp. 43-45).

Dr. Counts acknowledges that he does not have all of the details worked out: "What precise form a democratic society will take in the age of science and the machine, we cannot know with any assurance today." On the other hand—

We must * * * insist on two things: First, that technology be released from the fetters and the domination of every type of special privilege; and, second, that the resulting system of production and distribution must be made to serve directly the masses of the people. Within these limits, as I see it, our democratic tradition must of necessity evolve and gradually assume an essentially collectivistic pattern. The only conceivable alternative is the abandonment of the last vestige of democracy and the frank adoption of some modern form of feudalism (ibid. pp. 45-46).

Continuing, Dr. Counts says:

The important point is that fundamental changes in the economic system are imperative. Whatever services historic capitalism may have rendered in the past, and they have been many, its days are numbered. With its deification of the principle of selfishness, its exaltation of the profit motive, its reliance upon the forces of competition, and its placing of property above human rights, it will either have to be displaced altogether or changed so radically in form and spirit that its identity will be completely lost.

* * * The growth of science and technology has carried us into a new age where ignorance must be replaced by knowledge, competition by cooperation, trust in Providence by careful planning, and private capitalism by some form of socialized economy.

* * * The day of individualism in the

production and distribution of goods is gone. The fact cannot be overemphasized that choice is no longer between individualism and collectivism. It is rather between two forms of collectivism: the one essentially democratic, the other feudal in spirit; the one devoted to the interests of the people, the other to the interests of a privileged class (ibid. pp. 47-49).

The same basic premise is summarized in "A Call to the Teachers of the Nation," issued in 1933 by the Committee of the Progressive Education Association on Social and Economic Problems, of which Dr. Counts was chairman. This committee had been created as a sequel to Dr. Counts' Baltimore address. Although Dr. Willard W. Beatty, president of the PEA, carefully emphasized in an introductory statement that the report "does not commit either the board of directors of the association or the members of the association to any program or policy embodied in the report," the committee included outstanding leaders in the progressive education movement—Merle Curti, John Gamba, Sidney Hook, Jesse Newlon, Dr. Beatty, Charles Easton, Frederiek Reeder, and Goodwin Watson, in addition to Dr. Counts.

The premise of the doom of capitalism and its inevitable replacement by collectivism is stated in the "Call" as follows:

We must decide in whose interests our mighty mechanism for the production and distribution of goods is to be managed. It might be made to serve either the few or the many; it cannot be made to serve both. * * *

Clearly, if democracy is to survive, it must be divorced from its union with the simple agrarian life of the past and be adjusted to the complex industrial society of the present. In the sphere of economic relationships, it must be dissociated from its individualistic connections and be rephrased in terms of the collectivist reality. The old foundations are gone. In the highly integrated social order of the twentieth century individual men cannot own and operate the means of production as they did at the time of the founding of the Nation. As a consequence, the fulfillment of the old ideal requires a reversal of loyalties at certain points. Today the individual can be guaranteed freedom for cultural and spiritual growth only by the abandonment of economic individualism. Liberty of persons is no longer to be attained through freeing business enterprise from restraints but rather through deliberate organization in the name of material security for all. Thus the democratic tradition has come to the end of an era. If its spirit is to live on, its forms must suffer radical change (pp. 16, 17, ibid.).

It is all as simple and neat as that.

This same premise that capitalism is dead, or dying, and that its replacement by some form of collectivism, by some form or degree of Government-planned economy, governmental control or socialization essentially new and different in character, is both inevitable and desirable, underlies the Conclusions and Recommendations of the Commission on Social Studies sponsored by the American Historical Association.

This report, constituting the seventh and last volume of a series of publications by the commission, marked the consummation of commission studies and activities extending from January 1929 to December 1933. As previously mentioned, Dr. Counts served as research director for the commission from August 1, 1931, until the termination of its operations.

The premise of the inevitable replacement of capitalism by collectivism, constituted the "general point of view or frame of reference" of the Conclusions and Recommendations of the commission—page 3. This premise is elaborated as follows:

Under the molding influence of socialized processes of living, drives of technology and science, pressures of changing thought and policy, and disrupting impacts of economic disaster, there is a notable waning of the once widespread popular faith in economic individualism; and leaders in public affairs, supported by a growing mass of the population, are demanding the introduction into economy of ever wider measures of planning and control (p. 16).

The report continues:

Cumulative evidence supports the conclusion that, in the United States as in other countries, the age of individualism and laissez faire in economy and government is closing and that a new age of collectivism is emerging.

The report acknowledges that "as to the specific form which this 'collectivism,' this integration and interdependence, is taking and will take in the future, the evidence at hand is by no means clear or unequivocal. It may involve the limiting or supplanting of private property by public property or it may entail the preservation of private property, extended and distributed among the masses."

The report speculates that—

Most likely, it will issue from a process of experimentation and will represent a com-

posite of historic doctrines and social conceptions yet to appear.

However, the Conclusions and Recommendations are emphatic as to the "inevitability" of expanding government and expanding exercise of governmental compulsion:

Almost certainly it will involve a larger measure of compulsion as well as voluntary cooperation of citizens in the conduct of the complex national economy, a corresponding enlargement of the functions of government, and an increasing state intervention in fundamental branches of economy previously left to individual discretion and initiative—a state intervention that in some instances may be direct and mandatory and in others indirect and facilitative. In any event the Commission is convinced by its interpretation of available empirical data that the actually integrating economy of the present day is the forerunner of a consciously integrated society in which individual property rights will be altered and abridged (pp. 16-17).

The Commission emphasizes the viewpoint that "the emerging age is particularly an age of transition." Elaborating this point, it adds:

It is marked by numerous and severe tensions arising out of the conflict between the actual trend toward integrated economy and society, on the one side, and the traditional practices, dispositions, ideas, and institutional arrangements inherited from the passing age of individualism, on the other. In all the recommendations that follow the transitional character of the present epoch is recognized (pp. 17-18).

The Commission succinctly capsules its fundamental premise in the proposition that collectivism is "the future already coming into reality"—page 37.

Essentially this same premise found significant expression in the report of the Committee on Education for the New America of the Department of Superintendence of the NEA—now the American Association of School Administrators. This report was presented at the seventy-second annual meeting of the NEA, June 30-July 6, 1934, in Washington, D. C., by Dr. Willard E. Givens, then superintendent of schools of Oakland, Calif., and for many years since executive secretary of the NEA.

The pertinent statement was as follows:

A dying laissez-faire must be completely destroyed and all of us, including the "owners," must be subjected to a large degree of social control. (NEA Proceedings, 1934, pp. 647-655.)

Even more significant, in reflecting the definite Socialist trend of thinking in the group which drafted the report, is the following excerpt:

A large section of our discussion group, accepting the conclusions of distinguished students, maintain that in our fragile, interdependent society the credit agencies, the basic industries and utilities cannot be centrally planned and operated under private ownership. Hence, they will join in creating a swift Nation-wide campaign of adult education which will support President Roosevelt in taking these over and operating them at full capacity as a unified national system in the interest of the people (*ibid* p. 647).

This statement on the thinking of the group raises a question as to the consistency—if not the sincerity—of a subsequent declaration in the report that education will give the individual "a new appreciation of ownership of property" and that under the envisioned new order "the employer will be permitted to make a fair profit on his investment"—pages 647-9.

Further interesting evidence of this preoccupation of a representative segment of NEA membership, or leadership, with the possibility and desirability of achieving socialism is provided by the unusual action of the NEA at its 1933 meeting in Chicago. I refer to the following resolution, adopted by the delegates:

The officers of the NEA are requested to provide, through its journal and otherwise, reliable, authentic information for the use of its members concerning publicly owned, publicly controlled, and publicly operated gas, electric light, and power plants, especially as to the following items: (1) Name of municipality; (2) population; (3) rates of service; (4) net earnings to the municipality; (5) a similar showing concerning comparable privately owned and privately operated utility companies. (NEA Proceedings, 1933, p. 222.)

Incidentally, this resolution was published in the November 1933 NEA Journal—page 213—below an article on "How Public Ownership Reduces Rates," by Carl D. Thompson, secretary of the Public Ownership League. This article, advancing arguments for municipal and public ownership of utilities, was accompanied by suggestions for classroom activities in connection with this broad subject.

A major vehicle for expression and elaboration of the basic premise that capitalism must bow out in favor of collectivism was provided in the decade

from 1934 to 1944 by the educational journal, the Social Frontier and its successor, Frontiers of Democracy. These publications were launched specifically to promote the movement under discussion here. The former publication, edited by Dr. Counts, with Dr. William H. Kilpatrick as board chairman, numbered among its directors more than 60 leading American educators. I cite a number of typical expressions of this basic premise from the editorial columns of these publications, as well as from articles which appeared in these and other educational journals and books.

The lead editorial in the initial issue—October 1934—of the Social Frontier, which bore the title "Orientation," stated the basic premise which the journal was designed to promote:

For the American people the age of individualism in economy is closing and an age of collectivism is opening. Here is the central and dominating reality in the present epoch. * * *

* * * (The Social Frontier) represents a point of view, it has a frame of reference, it stands on a particular interpretation of American history. It accepts the analysis of the current epoch presented above and outlined in greater detail in Conclusions and Recommendations, Report on the Social Studies of the Commission of the American Historical Association.

The Social Frontier assumes that the age of individualism in economy is closing and that an age marked by a close integration of social life and by collective planning and control is opening. For weal or woe it accepts as irrevocable this deliverance of the historical process (pp. 3-4).

In the next issue—November 1934—the Social Frontier editorially elaborated its acceptance of collectivism as an inevitability:

The Social Frontier is not engaged in any battle for collectivism as such. That issue has been decided by the forces of history. As Prof. Walton Hamilton says in the last paragraph of a brilliant article in the Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, the "commitment to collectivism is beyond recall." * * *

* * * Accepting the rise of a collectivist order as irrevocable, it (the Social Frontier) refuses to adopt a fatalistic attitude toward the question of the form which collectivism is to take in the United States. * * *

The most crucial and fundamental of the choices which the American people will be called upon to make, which they are being called upon to make, has to do with controlling purposes and interests. * * * The Social Frontier will throw all the

strength it possesses on the side of those forces which are striving to fashion a form of collectivism that will make paramount the interests of the overwhelming majority of the population (pp. 3-4).

Despite this professed dismissal of concern over "the question of the form which collectivism is to take in the United States," the publication indicated the alternative to capitalism in fairly definite terms in an editorial in the April 1935 issue:

Loudest in the chorus of praise for freedom and imprecation for collectivism are the grateful beneficiaries of our inherited economic institutions. To them freedom is God and collectivism is Satan.

That the propagandas of profit-motivated reactionaries and the notions of honest but deluded liberals have gained a hold on the popular mind is due in no small measure to the failure of those committed to a collectivist social order to set up effective counter-propaganda and to disseminate true notions of liberalism. * * * The mistaken notion that democracy and freedom are identical with the institutions of property and profit should not be allowed to go unchallenged. On the contrary, teachers and laymen should make clear by all means at their disposal that a collectivist social order is not only necessary in a world of large scale production, corporate control, and human interdependence, but also that under these circumstances only social ownership and democratic control of the means of production can secure a free and democratic life (p. 9.)

In still another editorial in this same issue—April 1935—the Social Frontier pronounced this judgment of absolute doom upon capitalism:

The end of free business enterprise as a principle of economic and social organization adequate to this country is at hand (p. 8).

Nor did this publication, in the editorial development of its premise of the inevitability of collectivism, blink at the prospect that it must involve increasing regimentation. Quite the contrary. In an attack on a view expressed by former President Hoover, a June 1935 editorial insisted that there is "good" as well as "bad" regimentation:

With respect to Mr. Hoover's assumption that regimentation must inevitably lead to the conversion of this fair land into a zoo, it is legitimate to ask: What alternative have we? * * * The only other choice is the wilderness where the lions prey upon the lambs.

And finally, is economic regimentation really evil? Must it necessarily result in

the dehumanization of man? No general answer to these questions is possible. It all depends on who does the regimenting and the purpose the process is intended to serve. If regimentation is imposed by the few people at present in power, for the purpose of maintaining that power, it is evil because dehumanizing. The end products then are material, cultural, and spiritual poverty for the vast masses of people. But if regimentation is the consequence of the human urges of the millions who seek a life of work, dignity, security, and material and cultural plenty, it is humanizing and consequently good. Such regimentation is no regimentation at all; it is rather humanization, liberalization, and socialization (pp. 5-6).

The same basic premise of the necessary and inevitable replacement of capitalism with collectivism provided a major theme for many of the contributors to the magazine, *Progressive Education*, in the early 1930's, and for contributors to the *Social Frontier* and *Frontiers of Democracy* in the decade during which those journals were successively published. A few typical citations will suffice to illustrate the point.

Writing under the title, "Teachers Must Be Leaders," in *Progressive Education*, October 1932—pages 410-413—Jesse H. Newlon, director of the Lincoln school, said:

To effect a more equitable distribution of the national income, a curb must be put upon the operation of the profit motive. The making of profits can no longer be regarded as the chief aim of production. Production must be primarily for use. Integration and planned control of the agencies of production and distribution are inescapable in production primarily for use. They can be achieved only through organs of economic planning that can exercise wise control over credit and over many basic industrial and agricultural operations. To accomplish these ends will necessitate fundamental modifications of our forms and processes of government, both national and local, in order to adapt them to contemporary needs.

In an address before the Sixth World Fellowship of the New Education Fellowship—the international organization of the Progressive Education movement—at Nice, France, in 1932, Dr. Harold Rugg, professor of education at Teachers College, Columbia University, declared:

The world is on fire, and the youth of the world must be equipped to combat the conflagration. Nothing less than thoroughgoing social reconstruction is demanded. (*Progressive Education*, December 1932-January 1933, pp. 11-18.)

About a year later, Dr. Rugg wrote:

We know now beyond cavil that sufficient physical and human resources exist on the North American Continent to give every man, woman, and child a standard of life several times higher than the minimum of 1929. But we know also that to do so a vast degree of socialization in the central control and operation of the entire continental system of production and distribution must be instituted now. * * *

* * * Advocates of the democratic method who are troubled by the image of a destroyed Bill of Rights evoked by the Fascist specter * * * are desperately striving for a program of socialization of the production-distribution system which will be carried out with the "consent" of the people. (*Progressive Education*, January-February 1933, pp. 3-5; the *Educator* and the *Scientific Study of Society*.)

Granville Hicks, at the time assistant professor of English at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute and later a member of the editorial board of *The Masses*, writing in the January-February 1934, *Progressive Education*—pages 49-54—on "The Social Interpretation of Literature," tersely stated the premise we are documenting here:

Today the majority of those authors who make any attempt to portray contemporary life frankly admit that the capitalist system is doomed.

Hicks was an exponent of the view that "Marxism must be the basis for the analysis of literature as a social phenomenon," as opposed to "the conventional methods of teaching English, which give the student a cultural polish without challenging any of his convictions, without raising any serious questions about the existing order."

The Roosevelt New Deal provided exponents of the collectivist premise with the opportunity—which they fully capitalized on—to emphasize the fact that they were talking about something more sweeping than palliative reforms of capitalism. Their praise of Roosevelt's program was always qualified by a reminder of that fact.

Thus, a statement drafted by Willard W. Beatty, president of the Progressive Education Association, and published in the October 1933, *Progressive Education*, page 304, said:

Despite the tremendous efforts which the [Roosevelt] administration has put forth in the short period since it took over the reins of Government, we have made no more than the most preliminary steps along a new pathway.

Norman Woelfel, subsequently managing editor of the *Social Frontier* and even later professor of education at Ohio State University, wrote an article, "The Educator, the New Deal, and Revolution," in the January-February 1934, *Progressive Education*, in which he insisted that the then current phrase, "the Roosevelt revolution" was a misnomer. The Roosevelt program, he wrote, deserved the educators' support only because it left open "the path to a more revolutionary future." He urged educators to provide "stimulus to further leftward responses on the part of the administration," but made clear that "what really has happened is, of course, far from being a revolution" since "the traditional pattern of administering the industrial resources of the Nation by private business in the interest of money profit remains the same."

Dr. Woelfel then defined his conception and goal of revolution by asserting that it:

Implies that there be no unnecessary delay in making completely public the ownership and control of the natural resources and the industrial structure of the Nation (pp. 107-112).

And he added bluntly that in the achievement of this purpose "we must not blindly shrink from the fact that it may require some use of force against those at present privileged."

The same reminder that the Roosevelt program fell far short of the premise and goal of collectivist reconstruction was given by Dr. Henry Pratt Fairchild writing in the October 1934, *Social Frontier*:

The old economic structure is a house built upon the sands, and the President, instead of doing anything to install a firm foundation or to move the house over to bedrock, contents himself with putting in a new beam here, shoring up a wall there, and spreading whitewash liberally wherever he can find an exposed surface.

This is the tragedy of the New Deal. * * *

There are many, even in capital-minded America * * * who will not be satisfied with a New Deal—they want a new deck (pp. 15-18, *A Sociologist Views the New Deal*).

Broadus Mitchell, associate professor of economics at Johns Hopkins University, writing in the April 1936 *Social Frontier* criticized the "apologists of capitalism" who talk of correcting the shortcomings of the economic order "within the framework of the present system." And he pointed to a small

group of American economists "but rapidly growing, which finds the only practicable exit in the common ownership of the social means of production and in their operation for use rather than for profit"—pages 215-217.

One of the popular, euphemistic phrases used by many of these educators to define the desired collectivism was "social design"—a polite term for governmental control or ownership. Thus, Dr. Theodore Brameld, professor of education at New York University, wrote in *Frontiers of Democracy*—January 15, 1940, pages 111-112, 126-127:

We need today a design for tomorrow. We need an American design which encompasses and unifies the partial, contradictory, often destructive plans of our traditional economy. We need a design where nature's goods at last are consciously, collectively controlled by the majority of our people.

And a few months earlier, Dr. Harold Rugg, professor of education at Columbia Teachers' College wrote—*Frontiers of Democracy*, October 15, 1939, pages 9-11:

A large-scale, sustained-yield economy can be operated here if a practicable social design and an efficient and socially acceptable scheme of control can be provided. Both seem to me to be called for; the design must be comprehensive enough to cross any boundaries, either of States or personally owned properties that interfere with the efficient and humane operation of the social system. The central control to administer it must be created by the people themselves.

And Dr. Rugg adds, "that, it seems to me, is what we must teach." Regarding that latter assertion, I will have more to say later.

Again, permit me to point out, the advocates of collectivism did not dodge the fact that a planned economy means a controlled economy and a controlled economy means governmental regimentation. Thus Dr. Harry Elmer Barnes wrote in *Frontiers of Democracy*, January 15, 1940, under the title "Should Social Change be Consciously Directed?"—pages 106-110:

The only way to plan is to plan. It is impossible to graft a planned economy on to a competitive economic order and still hope to preserve the latter. Planning is compatible only with a considerable amount of collectivism and economic regimentation.

Friends of planned social change might as well recognize this fact and either withdraw from the movement or be prepared for the regimentation of economic life and the restriction of complete intellectual free-

dom which effective planning must entail. On the other hand, there is no reason for believing that effective planning must involve so ruthless a type of mental and social regimentation as the Soviet Union and the Fascist states have instituted. But it is equally certain that Stalin and Coolidge will not mix. We cannot have social planning without paying a price therefore in terms of some curtailment of pioneer individualism and freedom. Let those who count the price too high reflect that the alternative is chaos and misery which would make the bank holiday of early March 1933, seem a beatific idyll by comparison.

These views also found expression outside of the journals I have been quoting.

Dr. John Dewey, patron saint of progressive education, wrote in his "Liberalism and Social Action," page 90:

Earlier liberalism regarded the separate and competing economic action of individuals as the means to social well-being as the end. We must reverse the perspective and see that socialized economy is the means of free and individual development as the end.

Stuart Chase, in his address before the Department of Superintendence of the NEA at its Atlantic City meeting, February 25, 1935—NEA Journal, April 1935, pages 107-110—said:

If we have even a trace of realism in our natures, we must be prepared to see an increasing amount of collectivism, Government interference, centralization of economic control, social planning. Here again, the relevant question is not how to get rid of Government interference, but how to apply it for the greatest good of the greatest number.

Writing in the thirteenth yearbook of the department of superintendence of the NEA—1935—Dr. John L. Childs, professor of education at Teachers College, Columbia, said:

Democracy is supposed to denote a society in which control is by and for the people. Under present industrial conditions democratic control can be made a reality only by the collective ownership of those industries whose coordinated administration is essential to the success of a planned economy (p. 133).

* * * Enough data are now available * * * to show the general direction in which we must go. Industrialism points to national social planning. Our national ideal of social democracy requires that this planning be under collective control. Collective control cannot be made a reality in a regime of private ownership of the basic industries. Undoubtedly we can learn much from the experience of other countries, par-

ticularly Russia, but we also have our own unique conditions, resources, and ideals, and it would be disastrous for us to import wholesale the social methods of Communist Russia. Until we have seriously undertaken the task of inventing economic and political institutions which will make effectual social planning possible in our country and which will also seek to promote a career for individual initiative, we need not prematurely assume that collective planning and dictatorial bureaucratic regimentation of social life are necessary correlatives (pp. 137-138).

The citations could be endless. But nothing could more graphically sum up this commitment to the premise that capitalism must inevitably be replaced by collectivism than these concluding lines from a report on an educators' tour of Russia, written by Dr. Goodwin Watson, professor of education at Teachers College, Columbia, and a member of the Social Frontier board of directors—the Social Frontier, February 1937, page 143:

For each of us there were sights we approved and others we disapproved, but how about the balance of judgment on the new civilization as a whole? One became skeptical and remained rather unfavorable toward Soviet life. A half dozen who came prepared to find a bad situation had been transferred into warm admirers of the Communist scene. None who came with high expectations has been disappointed. The sum total would be more than 95 percent favorably influenced by this brief study. We had not always been comfortable, but we had been aware of a society directed toward the sustenance of major human values.

One question lingered in our minds. Anna Louise Strong had stated it for us. "I wish I knew," she said, "whether it will take longer for the Russians to develop efficiency or for America to develop socialism. Then I'd know where I want to live."

VI. UTOPIA VIA THE SCHOOLHOUSE

The educational movement here being described involves not only a summons to a belief but a summons to action—action on the part of teachers and school administrators, in and through the public schools, in behalf of that belief.

Therein lies the enormous and ominous significance of that movement. And therein lies the importance and relevancy of the premise documented in the preceding section.

There can be no question as to the right of a public school teacher to accept and, as an American citizen, to promote outside the classroom the premise that capitalism will or should be re-

placed by collectivism. That, incidentally, is not saying that a member of the Communist party should be permitted to teach in the public schools. The National Education Association and I are in perfect agreement on the proposition that Communist party membership disqualifies a person from teaching in the public schools of the United States.

The teacher's right of personal belief and advocacy, stated above, is one thing. It is something else, however, to propose that the teachers become the active agents for the promotion of collectivism as a part of their activities in the classroom, before the involuntary audience of pupils. It is something else, too, to propose that public education become the agency and medium for accomplishing that purpose.

Yet this is precisely the program of action advocated by the movement and activities here being documented. It is a proposal that, in the phrase I have already quoted from Dr. Kilpatrick, "the school take an active part in helping to build the new social order."

We will, in documenting this proposed course of action, encounter a variety of terms to describe the classroom process involved in this program. The blunt word, "propagandize" is sometimes used—though rarely. "Indoctrination" is another of the more forthright terms used—and the question of just what constitutes indoctrination becomes a subject of hair-splitting controversy among the educators. There are more euphemistic terms. Those who are hesitant to advocate outright classroom indoctrination in behalf of the collectivist goal, still accept collectivism as the "frame of reference" and basic "orientation" of the new education. The "democratic vision" of the possibilities of the new order are to be presented to the pupil, and his loyalties enlisted in its behalf. The objective is defined as that of attaining "uncoerced persuasion."

By whatever name it is called, the basic premise remains the same—the schools are actively to participate in building "the new social order" or in preparing and conditioning the child for participation in that order.

And that means, of course, that the educational system, its procedures and curriculum, are themselves to be reconstructed and revised to the extent necessary to carry out this program of action.

But let the advocates and spokesman of utopia-via-the-schoolhouse say it in their own words.

The whole point and purpose of Dr. Counts' original address at the Baltimore meeting, of his subsequent monograph, and of the "Call to the Teachers" which he inspired was, of course, that the teachers and the schools were to do something about it. The premise is implicit in the challenging title of the monograph, "Dare the School Build a New Social Order?" The Call to the Teachers was not alone a call to belief, but to action as well.

In the Baltimore speech, Dr. Counts elaborated the achievements of the Progressive Education movement since its inception in 1921. Impressive though these achievements were, he held that there was something still lacking. "There is no good individual apart from some conception of the nature of the good society," he argued. Likewise, "there is no good education apart from some conception of the nature of the good society." What progressive education lacks is a "theory of social welfare." The corrective?

If progressive education is to be genuinely progressive, it must emancipate itself from the influence (of the upper middle class), face squarely and courageously every social issue, come to grips with life in all of its stark reality, establish a theory of social welfare, fashion a compelling and challenging vision of human destiny, and become somewhat less frightened than it is today at the bogeys of imposition and indoctrination. (Progressive Education, April 1932, p. 257.)

The "challenging vision of human destiny," as we have already abundantly documented of course is collectivism.

Changes in our economic system will—

Dr. Counts declared—

of course, require changes in our ideals.

And the role of the school must be an active one in promoting these changes:

When I say that progressive education should face all of these questions I do not mean merely that provision should be made in our progressive schools for children to study the problems of economics, government, and so on. This much, of course, should be done. But unless the progressive education movement wishes to change its name to the contemplative education movement, the goodwill education movement, or the hopeful education movement, it should go much further. To my mind, a movement honestly styling itself progressive should

engage in the positive task of creating a new tradition in American life, a tradition possessing power, appeal, and direction.

But, you will say, is this not leading us out upon very dangerous ground? Is it not taking us rather far from the familiar landmarks bounding the fields that teachers are wont to cultivate? My answer is, of course, in the affirmative. * * * If we are content to remain where all is safe and quiet and serene, we shall dedicate ourselves, as teachers have commonly done in the past, to a role of relatively complete futility, if not of positive social reaction. Neutrality with respect to the great issues that agitate society, while perhaps theoretically possible, is practically tantamount to giving support to the most powerful forces engaged in the contest (ibid. pp. 262-3).

That the role which Dr. Counts envisioned for the school involved active promotion in the schoolroom in behalf of "a coordinated, planned, and socialized economy" is clearly indicated in his further statement:

You will also say, no doubt, that I am flirting with the idea of indoctrination. And my answer is again in the affirmative, or, at least, I should say that the word does not frighten me. We may all rest assured that the younger generation in any society will be thoroughly imposed upon by its elders and by the culture into which it is born. For the school to work in a somewhat different direction with all the power at its disposal could do no great harm. At the most, unless the superiority of its outlook is unquestioned, it can but serve as a counterpoise to check and challenge the power of less enlightened or more selfish purposes (pp. 262-263).

In his monograph, "Dare the School Build a New Social Order?" after describing the potential benefits of collectivism, Dr. Counts wrote:

Such a vision of what America might become in the industrial age, I would introduce into our schools as the supreme imposition, but one to which our children are entitled—a priceless legacy which it should be the first concern of our profession to fashion and bequeath. The objection will, of course, be raised that this is asking teachers to assume unprecedented social responsibilities. But we live in difficult and dangerous times—times when precedents lose their significance (pp. 53-54).

And he repeats the view expressed in his earlier paper:

If the schools are to be really effective, they must become centers for the building, and not merely the contemplation of our civilization. This does not mean that we should endeavor to promote particular re-

forms through the educational system. We should, however, give to our children a vision of the possibilities which lie ahead and endeavor to enlist their loyalties and enthusiasms in the realization of the vision. Also, our social institutions and practices, all of them, should be critically examined in the light of such a vision (pp. 36-37).

Then comes this bold counsel, regarding which we will have more to say later:

That the teachers should deliberately reach for power and then make the most of their conquest is my firm conviction. To the extent that they are permitted to fashion the curriculum and procedures of the school they will definitely and positively influence the social attitudes, ideals, and behavior of the coming generation. * * * It is my observation that the men and women who have affected the course of human events are those who have not hesitated to use the power that has come to them (pp. 27-30).

The "Call to the Teachers" is a call to participate "actively in the task of reconstituting the democratic tradition and of thus working positively toward a new society"—page 19. They "must work boldly and without ceasing for a better social order."

That what is demanded is a complete revision of the teacher's role both in society and in the schools is made crystal clear by the following injunction, one which should do more to provoke curiosity as to what's going on in the schools than all of the criticisms of lay groups or individuals:

If the teachers are to play a positive and creative role in building a better social order, indeed if they are not to march in the ranks of economic, political, and cultural reaction, they will have to emancipate themselves completely from the domination of the business interests of the Nation, cease cultivating the manners and associations of bankers and promotion agents, repudiate utterly the ideal of material success as the goal of education, abandon the smug middle-class tradition on which they have been nourished in the past, acquire a realistic understanding of the forces that actually rule the world, and formulate a fundamental program of thought and action that will deal honestly and intelligently with the problems of industrial civilization. They will have to restate their philosophy of education, reorganize the procedures of the school, and redefine their own position in society. Such measures will of course require fundamental changes in the methods of teacher training and the assumption on the part of the profession of an increasing burden of cultural leadership (pp. 20-22).

The reference to changes in methods of teacher training should particularly be noted. It is a reminder of the basic importance of the teacher training institutions to the entire educational program. And, by the same token, it reinforces a basic premise of this documentation, namely, that the extent of the permeation of collectivist philosophy into teacher colleges in an important index—the most important index—to the extent of the permeation of that philosophy into the public-school classroom.

That what Dr. Counts envisioned is also a complete revision of the philosophy and role of the school in society is made equally clear by the following:

In the collectivist society now emerging the school should be regarded, not as an agency for lifting gifted individuals out of the class into which they were born and of elevating them into favored positions where they may exploit their less-favored fellows, but rather as an agency for the abolition of all artificial social distinctions and of organizing the energies of the Nation for the promotion of the general welfare. This, of course, does not mean that the individual should not be encouraged to succeed. It means instead that he should be given a new measure of success.

Throughout the school program the development of the social rather than the egoistic impulses should be stressed; and the motive of personal aggrandizement should be subordinated to social ends. In promotion practices, in school activities, in the relations of pupils and teachers and administrators, the ideal of a cooperative commonwealth should prevail, due allowance being made for the requirements of special knowledge and the discharge of social responsibility. * * * All of this applies quite as strictly to the nursery, the kindergarten, and the elementary school as to the secondary school, the college, and the university (pp. 20-22).

Plainly this is a blueprint for converting the schools—from nursery through high school, and upward to college and university—into agencies for promoting the collectivist social order and developing a generation acquiescent to that social order.

The opening wedge for such a program was provided in the Conclusions and Recommendations of the American Historical Association's Commission on Social Studies.

The point of entry is clearly defined and adroitly chosen. The commission proposed consolidation of the traditional high-school subjects of geography,

economics, cultural sociology, political science or civics, and history, in a single educational category to be designated the "social sciences."

It is obvious that this is the most strategic of all teaching areas so far as advancement of collectivist philosophy is concerned. Success in enlisting the teachers in this field in the cause of the "new social order" would have an effect and influence out of all proportion to the relative number of teachers involved.

The commission's Conclusions and Recommendations were addressed particularly to this area of education, and evidence of the purpose to exploit this newly designated educational field is found in the following recommendation:

The commission * * * deems desirable * * * the incorporation into the materials of social science instruction in the schools of the best plans and ideals of the future of society and of the individual (p. 27).

This particular paragraph brought a tart rejoinder from one "unreconstructed rebel" on the commission. Isaiah Bowman, who appended a minority report to the commission's recommendations, asked simply, "Who is to know the best?" No answer was forthcoming. But the answer is clearly implied in the document—the educators, of course, are the ones who will "know the best."

Bearing in mind the commission's conclusion that collectivism "is the future already coming into reality," the following recommendations clearly indicate the sweeping reconstruction of the schools and the education program proposed to serve this "future":

Organized public education in the United States, much more than ever before, is now compelled, if it is to fulfill its social obligation, to adjust its objectives, its curriculum, its methods of instruction, and its administrative procedure to the requirements of the emerging integrated order. * * * It must recognize the new order and proceed to equip the rising generation to cooperate effectively in the increasingly interdependent society and to live rationally and well within its limitations and possibilities (pp. 35-36).

By way of conditioning the child for this new order, "in the organization of the life of the school and the conduct of instruction, emphasis will be placed on the development of the social and creative rather than the acquisitive impulses"—page 40.

Furthermore, "the competent teacher, sensitive to the implications of the democratic ideal and conscious of the growing interdependence of social life, will appeal as little as possible to those motives which tend to exacerbate the struggle between individuals and will encourage the fullest development of the social and creative impulses"—page 81.

The import of these recommendations was accurately summed up by the late Professor Harold J. Laski, philosopher of British socialism, in an article in *The New Republic*, July 29, 1936:

At bottom, and stripped of its carefully neutral phrases, the report is an educational program for a socialist America (pp. 342-345).

Mr. Laski further commented that the report calls for "education for a life socially controlled," and for "a teaching that definitely emphasizes the implications of a new social orientation." More later about Mr. Laski's estimate of this report.

The educational literature produced by the disciples and sponsors of this program is filled with plans for reshaping education for this new task of social reconstruction.

Dr. Harold Rugg, in his address before the New Education Fellowship in Nice, France, in 1932, said:

Before the school can be used as an agent for social regeneration, it must undergo thorough reconstruction.

How is the problem to be attacked? The first step is the building of a new program of work, a new content for the curriculum, directly out of the problems, issues and characteristics of our changing society. (*Progressive Education*, December 1932-January 1933, pp. 11-18.)

Among "the basic concepts that should constitute the guiding skeleton of our new educational program," according to Dr. Rugg, is the alleged "need for change in political, economic, and social government" and "the utter lack of economic government in the modern world."

Therefore:

Our new materials of instruction shall illustrate fearlessly and dramatically the inevitable consequence of the lack of planning and of central control over the production and distribution of physical things.

The large-scale undertaking assigned to the schools in promoting the new social order is made clear in this further comment by Dr. Rugg:

Thus through the schools of the world, we shall disseminate a new conception of Government—one that will embrace all of the collective activities of men; that will postulate the need for scientific control and operation of economic activities in the interests of all of the people. Political government in a new connotation, then, including economic government and social government.

Dr. Willard W. Beatty, president of the Progressive Education Association, writing in 1933, asserted that the educator "who would contribute materially to social planning" must "be prepared to undertake the instruction of children for their share in the new order"—*Progressive Education*, October 1933, page 304.

Dr. Norman Woelfel, in the January-February 1934 *Progressive Education*, argues that "educators are inevitably propagandists for one kind of social order or another."

Woelfel holds that with "our thin crust of culture breaking before our eyes" the educators' "ancient tactics of care and tact and impartiality are, of course, basically futile today." Neutrality is out:

If we wish to mutter longer the old rhetoric about democracy, as we pursue under capitalism our almost secret routine in the schools, that is a possible choice also, but there can be no assurance that it will long remain a possible alternative. If we will, as teachers, individually and then collectively, make this fundamental choice between clearly distinct social ideals, further procedures will be envisioned more clearly (pp. 107-112).

But the real danger before educators, as Dr. Woelfel sees it, is "this mental attitude which makes a supreme virtue out of listening to both sides forever and forever without ever making a decision." Obviously mere teaching about socialism is not enough for him.

This same premise that the purpose of teaching is not merely to present alternatives but actively to propagandize in behalf of a definite course of action is stated in a *Social Frontier* editorial on "The Ives Law"—October 1934, page 9:

They (the teachers) should proceed to a consideration of the changes in its (the Constitution's) provisions which the rise of industrial civilization is making desirable or necessary. And in doing all this, they should endeavor to carry their pupils with them.

Dr. John Dewey, while exceedingly dextrous in the manipulation of words, makes it equally clear that the premise

of a collectivist social order calls for action in its behalf in the classroom. Because of his immense influence in modern education, I quote Dr. Dewey's statement at some length—"Can Education Share in Social Reconstruction?"—*Social Frontier*, October 1934, pages 11-12:

I do not think * * * that the schools can in any literal sense be the builders of a new social order. But the schools will surely as a matter of fact and not of ideal, share in the building of the social order of the future according as they ally themselves with this or that movement of existing social forces. This fact is inevitable. The schools of America have furthered the present social drift and chaos by their emphasis upon an economic form of success which is intrinsically pecuniary and egoistic. They will of necessity, and again not as a matter of theory, take an active part in determining the social order—or disorder—of the future, according as teachers and administrators align themselves with the older so-called "individualistic" ideals—which in fact are fatal to individuality for the many—or with the newer forces making for social control of economic forces. The plea that teachers must passively accommodate themselves to existing conditions is but one way—and a cowardly way—of making a choice in favor of the old and chaotic.

If the teacher's choice is to throw himself in with the forces and conditions that are making for change in the direction of social control of capitalism—economic and political—there will hardly be a moment of the day when he will not have the opportunity to make his choice good in action. If the choice is conscious and intelligent, he will find that it affects the details of school administration and discipline, of methods of teaching, of selection and emphasis of subject-matter. * * * The task is to translate the desired ideal over into the conduct of the detail of the school in administration, instruction and subject matter. Here, it seems to me, is the great present need and responsibility of those who think the schools should consciously be partners in the construction of a changed society. The challenge to teachers must be issued and in clear tones. But the challenge is merely a beginning. What does it mean in the particulars of work in the school and on the playground? An answer to this question and not more general commitment to social theory and slogans is the pressing demand.

An editorial in the April 1935 *Social Frontier* rebukes the magazine, the *Nation*, for criticizing a statement attributed to Dr. Jesse H. Newlon to the effect that "teachers are today justified in assuming a partisan position upon basic social and economic issues and in preaching

the apparent truth of an impending collectivism." The critical view taken by the *Nation*, the editorial asserts, amounts to saying that "educational leaders are stepping over the proper bounds when they advise that teachers should build in youth attitudes more vital than that expressed in the platitudinous affirmation, 'there is much to be said on both sides'"—page 7. In the same issue, the *Social Frontier* calls upon teachers "to make clear by all means at their disposal that only social ownership and democratic control of the means of production can secure a free and democratic life." And it urges "effective counter propaganda" against the "propagandas of profit-motivated reactionaries"—page 9.

The same view that "education cannot be neutral" was expressed by Dr. Newlon, during a panel discussion before the Department of Superintendence—NEA—meeting February 26, 1935. Dr. Newlon, professor of education and director of Lincoln School, Teachers College, Columbia, insisted that "the school will be employed either to support the existing order or to build a better social order"—NEA Proceedings, 1935, pages 540-541.

Dr. Harold Rugg, writing in the *Social Frontier* of October, 1936, emphasizes that "a necessary first step in educational reconstruction lies in the remaking of the curriculum"—pages 12-15. Teachers should be brought into contact with new ideas in order to change their "understanding, outlook and method." The importance of such a change is made clear: "To change the outlook and procedure of teachers is to change the very lives of the children in their care."

An extreme example of the proposed changes in curriculum and instructional material is provided by the comment of James M. Shields, former supervising principal of elementary schools at Winston-Salem, N. C.—*Social Frontier*, June 1936, pages 281-284:

It fairly staggers one to consider the tremendous task ahead in revision of our existing instructional literature if it is to be of any use at all in a collectivist society. Hardly a public school textbook now in use but is saturated with the profit psychology. Arithmetics are permeated with profit and loss, gain, "making" money. One would hunt in vain through their pages for any incentive to economic cooperation. Even geographies are replete with production for gain. And as for histories. No wonder the Rus-

slans started from scratch in creating an entire new educational literature under the Soviet system. Almost we may have to discover America anew.

The question of whether, and to what extent, "indoctrination" in behalf of the new collectivist social order is permissible, become a much debated issue in educational circles. It is not necessary to go into the technical details of this controversy. In many instances the views expressed by the same educators are self-contradictory. Dr. Rugg, for example, wrote—October 1936, *Social Frontier*, pages 12-15—that he did not advocate "the construction of any theoretical social order and its 'teaching' in the schools." Yet in the October 1939, *Frontiers of Democracy*, he insisted upon the necessity of a "scheme of central control" and added, "that is what we must teach"—pages 9-11.

Dr. Dewey similarly expressed disapproval of "undemocratic inculcation of ready-made conclusions" in the classroom, but added:

If teachers who hold that there is an intrinsic relationship between actualization of democracy and social planning of economic institutions and relations, hope to bring others to the same conclusions by use of the method of investigation and free cooperative discussion, I see nothing undemocratic in the procedure. It looks to me like an educational procedure and (one) * * * that teachers who have been led to accept the conclusion might then use with their own students. (*Social Frontier*, December 1938, pp. 71-72.)

Whatever the euphemisms employed to soothe suspicions, the basic fact remains that the program here being described contemplates activity in the classroom designed to propagandize for collectivism and designed to condition the child for a collectivist social order.

Dr. Boyd H. Bode, professor of education at Ohio State University, a sharp critic of this program, accurately described its propagandist character in a debate with Dr. John L. Childs in the columns of the *Social Frontier*:

Under the impetus of indignation * * * he (Dr. Childs) shows a disposition to identify democracy with a campaign for a specific scheme of ownership and distribution. Hand in hand with this goes a bold demand for "inculcation" and for a crusade to win adherents (November 1938, pp. 38-40).

Dr. Harry D. Gideonse—*Social Frontier*, January 1935, pages 15-18—rebuked

the proposed program even more sharply with this prophetic warning:

The peril of it all might well be that history (or social studies) under such a definition is likely to become a controversial subject comparable to religion and unsuitable for instruction in the schools for the same reason. Whatever propagandists may call such new "education," it smells like propaganda—and a viciously untruthful sort—under any other name. We might leave these things to the American equivalents of Moscow and of Dr. Goebbels. A free school should have no truck with it.

The length to which this action program in support of the collectivist society is carried is indicated by the assertion of Dr. Jesse H. Newlon—*Frontiers of Democracy*, April 15, 1941, pages 208-11—that "the so-called child-centered school goes into the ashcan." The school, Dr. Newlon held, must become "society centered." It was statements of this type which prompted John L. Tildsley, associate superintendent of the New York City schools, to question indignantly whether a person holding such educational views "has a moral right to enroll himself as a teacher of children or as a teacher of teachers-of-children"—*Social Frontier*, IV, pages 319-322. And Dr. Tildsley angrily charged that the leaders of this movement "lose sight of the child as the center of the educative process and are not concerned with his growth, save in one direction, namely, his growth into an accelerator of a democratic collectivist social order. They view the child as collectivist-futter—fodder—to be utilized without regard to the effect on him of the collectivist-society-making process."

VII. CLASS WAR IN THE CLASSROOM

Should the public school classroom become a battleground of the class war?

Should American teachers join in that war?

It is a shocking thing that such questions should even be asked in the United States.

It is vastly more shocking to find supposedly responsible American educators answering these questions in the affirmative.

Extremist advocates of the collectivist premise of course believe that the transition from capitalism to collectivism will probably, if not inevitably, involve stern resistance on the part of the owner

class and therefore lead to open conflict—political or worse—between the owner and worker classes of society. These extremists likewise hold that the schools cannot escape this conflict, and that teachers who would contribute to the realization of the collectivist society must cast their lot, in classroom and out, with the worker class.

Class war, of course, is a tenet of Marxism, and whether or not they accepted the Marxist label, the more extreme advocates of the achievement of collectivism-through-the-classroom embraced this class-war tenet.

Even Dr. Counts, who later vigorously repudiated communism, showed strong leanings toward this Marxist tenet in his earlier writings:

If democracy is to be achieved in the industrial age, powerful classes must be persuaded to surrender their privileges, and institutions deeply rooted in popular prejudice will have to be radically modified or abolished. And according to the historical record, this process has commonly been attended by bitter struggle and even bloodshed. Ruling classes never surrender their privileges voluntarily.

* * * There is little evidence from the pages of American history to support us in the hope that we may adjust our differences through the method of sweetness and light. (Dare the School Build a New Social Order? pp. 50-52.)

The implications of this view are developed in the "Call to the Teachers of the Nation":

Even the taxpayers have no special claim on the schools; they are but the tax collectors of society; ultimately school revenue comes from all who labor by hand or brain. This the teachers should never forget. Their loyalty therefore goes to the great body of the laboring population—to the farmers, the industrial workers, and the other members of the producing classes of the Nation. They owe nothing to the present economic system, except to improve it; they owe nothing to any privileged caste, except to strip it of its privileges (pp. 19-20).

One of the most vigorous advocates of collectivism-through-the-schools during the past 20 years has been Dr. Theodore Brameld, professor of education at New York University. Dr. Brameld held that "realistically minded teachers might profit by greater acquaintance with Marx." While disclaiming advocacy of Marxism, Brameld pointed out that "several of his"—Marx's—"basic postulates are likewise those of a considerable

group of progressive educators," especially his belief "that the profit system is the root of our social troubles" and his insistence "that collectivism has to replace it"—"Karl Marx and the American Teacher," Social Frontier, November 1935, pages 53-56.

Brameld called attention to Marx's statement in a letter to his friend Kugelmann that "the solution cannot proceed along pleasant lines." He emphasized the Marxian principle that "the opposition of the class in control of capitalist society is so tremendous that nothing short of counter-opposition frequently bordering upon, indeed crystallizing into, illegality will suffice to defeat it." Brameld declared that in Marx's view violence was to be avoided if possible; "but it should not be characterized categorically as immoral under all circumstances."

Dr. Brameld believed that Marxism "would applaud" the statement of Professor Newlon that "teachers must prepare to join in an organized way with the liberal forces seeking to build a better society, with labor, farmers, professionals and all others who do the actual productive work of the country, in the struggle of the people against special privilege"—Science and Society—A Marxian quarterly, fall, 1936, pages 1-17.

And Brameld held that, consistent with the Marxian strategy, teachers who wish to conduct their activity "within the school and without in behalf of the collectivist ideal must influence their students, subtly if necessary, frankly if possible, toward acceptance of the same position"—Social Frontier, November 1935, pages 53-55.

Dr. William H. Kilpatrick, chairman of the board of the Social Frontier, followed up publication of the Brameld article with an emphatic rejection of Marxism. But in the discussion which ensued the class approach to the fight for collectivism found vigorous espousal, even in one editorial in the Social Frontier. This editorial, in the February 1936 issue, pages 134-135, asserted:

To us the class approach to society appeals as the most promising to an understanding of the processes of history and the complexities, conflicts, difficulties, and problems of life today. It appeals to us, also, as an extremely useful point of departure for a method of bringing about those changes which are necessary for an equitable distribution of the goods of life.

There then follows this brutally frank line of argument:

If we wanted a society dominated by either men or women, by Negroes or Nordics, by Jews, Catholics, Protestants, or atheists, we would approach society with a sex, race, or religious orientation. But we want a society dominated by and managed in the interest of those who create national and cultural wealth. We want a society in which goods will be produced for use, and not for the profit of owners of means of production. We want a society in which the wealth-creating resources and instruments will be owned collectively, controlled democratically, and managed efficiently. We want a society in which the fruits of economic effort will be distributed in such a way as to liberate the masses of the people for creative and appreciative experiences in the realms of culture.

In the process of creating such a society the needed classification—and we have indicated that classification of one kind or another is necessary for social engineering—is the classification of “worker” and “owner.”

This classification, the editorial contends, meets the need for “an appeal that cuts across the maze of interests of the various groups” in society. “That appeal is the workers versus owners appeal.”

The editorial further holds that “America now consists of one self-conscious class and one class that is not yet self-conscious.” The “self-conscious class” is represented by the American Liberty League and the National Association of Manufacturers. The workers, of course, are the class “not yet self-conscious.”

On the basis of this premise, the editorial states its conception of the task of education:

In view of the absence of a class mentality among the workers, it would be reasonable to assume that it is the problem of education to induce such a mentality, rather than to take an existing mentality and base a course of action upon it. In the interests of a genuinely classless society the crucial class distinctions which now exist ought to be emphasized.

Despite the extremely radical departure from the traditional American conception of our society and of the role of education, advocates of this view are emphatic in their insistence upon it as a necessary feature of the reconstruction of both society and the school. This view is given forceful expression by Dr. John L. Childs, professor of education at Teachers' College, Columbia University:

No matter how unaccustomed we Americans may be to thinking and operating in class terms, if we are empirical, we cannot shut out this possibility on a priori grounds. Here, also, the appeal must be to conditions, and not simply to what old habits of mind make congenial.

The institutions and practices of our historic American economic individualism are in irreconcilable conflict with the patterns of life implicit in the present interdependent industrial economy. * * * The collective, scientific planning and utilization of resources, material and human, in the interest of the whole community * * * is incompatible with the continuance of the historic profit system. * * *

If affairs are studied in relation to vital national trends the “class” concept seems to many to be less doctrinaire than the “classless” doctrine. So also from an empirical point of view does the notion of a deepening conflict of interests between owners and workers correspond more closely to the actual situation than does the view that all will collaborate in the transformation of our economic system. (Can Teachers Stay Out of the Class Struggle? Social Frontier, April 1936, pp. 219-222.)

Dr. Childs further contends that “the educator who now seeks to compromise or reconcile” this difference between the owner-worker classes “is not using his energies to good advantage.” Childs is convinced that “we shall not make the transition to an effectual, planning society by the collaboration of all groups” and that “educators can play an important role” in the reconstruction of society only as they accept this premise.

Therefore, he concludes:

Educators, aware of what is now involved, and content to be guided by probabilities, in the absence of demonstrated certainty, should not find it difficult to decide where they belong in this deepening struggle of classes.

This view provoked violent dissent even among so-called liberal educators. In response to this criticism, Dr. Childs agreed that “the experimentalist educator will not encourage the preaching of violence and class hatred,” because “his experience teaches him that when passions of this sort are aroused, it is generally chance operating as brute force and not intelligence which decides the issue.” Such tactics, he warned, “might also lead to a sweeping reaction which could easily result in some form of Fascist control.”

But Dr. Childs still insisted that “the only adequate social point of view for education is one which includes as an

essential part the conception of the class struggle." And he warned that the experimentalist educator "will recognize that democracy involves the right of a majority to make its will prevail even if the power of government and law must be utilized to coerce reluctant minorities entrenched in outmoded institutional arrangements. Political democracy is not to be opposed to engaging in group and class struggles"—*The Social Frontier*, June 1936, pages 274-278.

It remained for Dr. Boyd H. Bode to reduce to man-in-the-street terms the import of what the advocates of class war in the classroom were proposing. He warned that however cleverly or carefully the proposals might be worded, the fine phraseology "must not be permitted to obscure the fact that this proposed scheme of education is deliberately aimed at fostering a disposition which will make the pupil intolerant and 'sore' with respect to the contrast between employers and workers"—*the Social Frontier*, November 1938, pages 38-40.

VIII. "FOLKS AREN'T GOING TO LIKE THIS"

From the very outset advocates of the promotion of a collectivist society through the public schools recognized the inevitability of powerful opposition to their program and its objectives. The leaders of the movement were too intelligent, too realistic, and too discerning not to do so.

The emphasis which they placed upon this anticipated opposition, and the pains to which they went to devise and recommend a strategy for overcoming that opposition, is itself a significant indication of the revolutionary character of their basic program.

Realization of the inevitability of this opposition explains Dr. Counts' statement, in his monograph, *Dare the School Build a New Social Order?*

We know full well that, if the school should endeavor vigorously and consistently to win its pupils to the support of a given social program, unless it were supported by other agencies, it could act only as a mild counterpoise to restrain and challenge the might of less enlightened and more selfish purposes (p. 24).

It was the same realization of this inevitable opposition which prompted Dr. Counts' startling injunction to teachers "deliberately"—to—"reach for power and then make the most of their conquest"—

page 30. In this same vein; Dr. Counts warned that—

The power that teachers exercise in the schools can be no greater than the power they wield in society.

For this reason teachers "must be prepared to stand on their own feet and win for their ideas the support of the masses of the people"—pages 30-31.

The problem posed by the certainty of powerful opposition is stated even more clearly in the "Call to the Teachers of the Nation":

Thus we are brought face to face with the paradox: The school must participate in the task of social reconstruction, yet until society is already transformed the school can scarcely hope to function effectively (p. 23).

The reason for this paradox is obvious. As the "Call" warned, efforts at social reconstruction through the schools are certain to be confronted by "the ignorance of the masses and the malevolence of the privileged."

No one saw more clearly the certainty of this opposition and the threat which it involved than Prof. Harold Laski. In describing the Conclusions and Recommendations of the American Historical Association commission as "an educational program for a Socialist America," Laski offered a powerful warning against the practical obstacles in the pathway of such a program—a program which, of course, he heartily endorsed. He said, with respect to this educational program:

It is a direct criticism of the ideals that have shaped capitalist America; the ideals, also, that American capitalists still stoutly hold. To them it says in effect: We want you to agree to the trial of educational practices built upon the assumption that you and all that you are stand in contradiction to the needs of America. Our spirit is a denial of your spirit. Where you deny, we affirm; where you affirm, we deny. What you think are the safeguards of America are the things we believe will work disaster for it. We ask you to allow the schools to be used for the destruction of those safeguards.

Continuing this interpretation of what the proposed program involves, Mr. Laski pointed out that it says, in effect, to the leaders and exponents of the present American way:

We want to fill them (the schools) with teachers who will analyze critically all the things for which you stand. We want to create in the schools a new generation which

will realize that your ideals, your purposes, your methods, are both dangerous and obsolete. We believe that it is to the interest of America—even, on a long view, to your interest—to help us to realize our program. Cannot we rely, in this crisis of America's destiny, upon your willing support for this adventure?

And, Laski concludes:

Virtually * * * the report (of the commission) asks the present owning class in America to cooperate in facilitating its own erosion. I know of no historic experience that makes that demand likely of fulfillment. * * * The report, I believe, underestimates the passion with which men cling to the religion of ownership; and its impact upon the votaries of that faith would, if they read it, lead less to conviction that conversion was desirable than to the angry perception that the liberal teacher is an even more dangerous heretic than they have hitherto been accustomed to affirm. (New Republic, July 29, 1936, pp. 342-345.)

John L. Tildsley, associate superintendent of the New York City schools, and a sharp critic of the Counts' program, envisioned opposition on an even broader scale:

Does Dr. Counts really believe that when he has won over the teachers to his revolutionary program, the parents, most of whom are opposed to the program, will continue to support teachers who (against the wishes of the parents) are making converts of their children for an industrial system that never has been operated successfully anywhere? (Social Frontier IV: 319-322.)

The same objections were anticipated by President Willard W. Beatty of the Progressive Education Association, writing in 1933:

We must recognize the fact that schools cannot offer their children instruction in political or economic doctrines which differ materially from those understood or accepted by the adult community. (Progressive Education, October 1933, p. 304.)

We will have occasion, presently, to note Beatty's formula for overcoming this obstacle.

In its final paragraph, the "Call to the Teachers of the Nation" stated the problem with breath-taking candor:

In conclusion, an obvious truth must be emphasized. The individual teacher cannot fight the battles of the profession alone. To advise him to do so, would be the counsel of madness. Working in isolation he cannot convert the school into an effective in-

strument of social reconstruction. If, unsupported by his colleagues, he should attempt any considerable part of the program outlined in these pages, almost inevitably his days as a teacher would be speedily numbered. He would fall before the onslaught of some body of witch hunters or some selfish interest (p. 26).

The problem is clearly enough defined. Its recognition by the advocates of social reconstruction through the schools is sufficiently established by these citations. I proceed to the various proposals for meeting this acknowledged hazard.

IX. STEPS TO POWER

However vague the leaders of the campaign for collectivism through the schools may be about some of the details of the new social order they are promoting, there is no corresponding vagueness about the measures they regard as necessary to equip and prepare the profession, and particularly its progressive element, for the coming struggle. There is no lack of imaginative and ambitious boldness in planning preparations for both offensive and defensive warfare.

The preparations envisioned include such mundane matters as professional tenure for teachers—job security, in other words—accumulation of necessary financial resources for the war chest, and even anticipation of need for legal aids. They include insistence by the teaching profession upon academic freedom, professional status, public deference to "trained judgment" of the educators, and, as a corollary, a minimum of "interference" by the lay public. There is recognition, too, of the need for "more liberal school boards"—since these agencies remain an unavoidable evil.

The proposed preparations also include strengthening of professional organizations and "solidarity," unionization of teachers, enlistment of the support of other social groups and organizations of kindred "liberal" spirit and aims, and even utilization of the "class approach" as a "resource" in the campaign. In a few instances the promoters of this campaign do not scruple to justify resort to deception and slyness.

Finally, and most ambitious of all, is the call for an all-out effort of adult education in behalf of the social reconstruction program—held to be necessary

to provide a favorable climate of public opinion, at least among the "thinking minority," and to assure the ultimate success of the immense undertaking of building a collectivist society.

It is hard to spot a detail in the preparations that these educational-reform strategists overlooked.

The "Call to the Teachers of the Nation" lists many of the essential steps which teachers must take to fortify themselves for the struggle: It warns that "any program of education designed for the coming generation, if it is to be successful, must march hand in hand and be closely coordinated with a program of adult and parent education."

Furthermore, it asserts the profession's "members must prepare to struggle cooperatively and valiantly for their rights and ideals. They must fight for tenure, for adequate compensation, for a voice in the formulation of educational policies; they must uphold the ancient doctrine of academic freedom and maintain all of their rights as human beings and American citizens"—pages 24-25.

Let me interject, at this point, that no right-thinking person would deny the public-school teacher any of his rights either as a human being or as an American citizen. The "Call" continues:

Also they must insist on the public recognition of their professional competence in the field of education; they must oppose every effort on the part of publishing houses, business interests, privileged classes, and patriotic societies to prescribe the content of the curriculum. * * *

* * * The progressive-minded teachers of the country must unite in a powerful organization, militantly devoted to the building of a better social order and to the fulfillment, under the conditions of industrial civilization, of the democratic aspirations of the American people. In the defense of its members against the ignorance of the masses and the malevolence of the privileged, such an organization would have to be equipped with the material resources, the legal talent, and the trained intelligence necessary to wage successful warfare in the press, the courts, and the legislative chambers of the Nation (p. 26).

The Conclusions and Recommendations of the American Historical Association commission stressed the need for the public to defer to the profession:

If the school is to discharge the highly conservative function of relieving tensions in American society and of bringing thought and reason to bear on social adjustment, then reliance must be placed on the trained judgment of those to whom the actual conduct of public education is entrusted (p. 125).

This commission also emphasized that:

If the teacher is * * * to free the school from domination of special interests * * * there must be a redistribution of power in the conduct of education. * * * The boards of education will have to be made more representative (p. 128).

This same preoccupation with the make-up of boards of education is revealed, with a note of pessimism, in a review of Dr. Counts' book, "The Schools Can Teach Democracy," by Dr. Harold C. Hand, associate professor of education at Stanford University:

Given the present class-composition of virtually all of our boards of education, and the administrator-dominated type of teachers' organization to which the vast majority of the affiliated teachers now belong, what hope that such a splendid program of democratic education could be translated into actual practice in the classroom? (Frontiers of Democracy, October 1939, p. 24.)

In a similarly pessimistic vein, John Lloyd Snell, writing on "Social Attitudes of California School Board Members"—February 1940, *Frontiers of Democracy*, pages 141-142—offered this conclusion:

In general, the preponderance of evidence afforded by the investigation shows that high-school board members in the State of California, judged by their affiliations with organizations, are allied with the more conservative elements in our society and, in general, share their attitudes. It seems logical to assume that this conservative attitude is now operating and will continue to operate to modify and limit the possible directions that education may take in the State. Few of the many needed departures from the traditional secondary school curriculum may be expected to emanate from high-school boards as set up at present in California.

One of the most recent restatements of the necessity of stronger teacher organization to protect members of the profession in their self-appointed task of social reconstruction was made by Kenneth D. Benne, in his presidential address

before the American Education Fellowship—Progressive Education Association—in 1951:

Both preservice education of teachers and in-service education, through conferences, institutes, study groups, and school experimentation, must help teachers * * * to become actors as well as students in the struggle to determine the shape of the future * * * whether progressive or static, reactionary and dead.

One other lesson teachers must learn. This is the lesson of organized professional responsibility and solidarity to protect schools and teachers in the responsible, daring and open study, discussion and experimentation which the teaching task requires; to enlist the aid and support of other forces and groups who, like progressive teachers, are devoted to a democratic future for America and the world in protecting the transformation of the schools, to oppose forces and groups which would make of schools the passive and impotent hawkers of harmless, irrelevant, and outworn knowledge and values, the agents of social reaction. (Progressive Education, April 1951, p. 196.)

A similar emphasis on "professional solidarity" is provided by the counsel of Superintendent Virgil M. Rogers of Battle Creek, Mich., in an address at the July 1951 NEA meeting in San Francisco. Dr. Rogers urged:

Teachers must close ranks professionally, remove the schisms, and solidly unite professionally in every community and throughout the Nation.

A statement prepared by the NEA Committee on Tenure and Academic Freedom rightfully asserts that "pupils need protection from the possible bias of teachers on certain issues" and that "community groups have the right to assume that they may justly protest, if convinced that both sides of an issue are not being fairly presented." At the same time, however, it cites as an example of "whims of unduly sensitive individuals or groups" criticism of a textbook which charged that "The typical newspaper is far from being impartial. Editorials that might offend big advertisers are not approved." And the statement insists that there is "need for professional solidarity in protesting all forms of censorship, suppression, and attacks on education" and "need for organized action from state and national arms of the profession for the preservation of our fundamental freedoms"—NEA Journal, May 1951, pages 321-322.

The call for professional solidarity takes many forms. Thus, Dr. Theodore Brameld, in his discussion of possible contributions of Marxism to the profession, said:

Particularly would he (Karl Marx) be pleased to see that at least a few teachers have already gone so far as to unionize themselves as a class, conscious of interests fundamentally separate from most school boards or from others sympathetic with the status quo. (Social Frontier, November 1935, pp. 53-56.)

Again, in *Science and Society*—A Marxian Quarterly—fall 1936, pages 1-17—Brameld wrote:

Marxism would applaud * * * the statement of Professor Newlon in the Social Frontier, "Teachers, if they are really opposed to suppression that is fascism, must prepare to join in an organized way with the liberal forces seeking to build a better society, with labor, farmers, professionals, and all others who do the actual productive work of the country, in the struggle of the people against special privilege."

That the purpose of such organization is not merely that of collective bargaining with respect to tenure, salaries, etc., is made clear by Dr. John Dewey—Social Frontier, April 1935, pages 11-12:

An open alliance of teachers with workers would greatly strengthen the educational as well as the economic position of the teaching body.

Organization among teachers is imperatively needed to stem the rising tide of brutal reaction and intimidation. But so many teachers are timid because of "hostages to fortune" that it is foolish to suppose that this organization will be adequate unless it is supported by wider and deeper organization with others who have a common interest in the reconstruction of the present regime of production for personal gain and personal power. * * *

What can be done? The direct answer is: join locals of the American Federation of Teachers where they exist; help form them where they do not exist. * * * I would heartily second the motion of Heywood Brown for an alliance of teachers with the Newspaper Guild. Actors and writers are organized or beginning to organize. Ministers in the churches, while not yet widely organized for other than purely professional purposes, have spoken, through their various organizations, more and more openly about the injustices of the present order.

What is needed is an aggressive alliance of these various groups. Divided, we may fall. United, we shall stand, and in standing shall do our special work.

It is significant that some educators flatly rejected this counsel. Thus, Dr. H. Gordon Hullfish, professor of education at Ohio State University, writing under the title, "Why I Am Resigning From the Teachers' Union," said:

I see no justification for throwing the allegiance of the school at either extreme (left or right), thus placing greater pressure upon the school than already exists, and this at a time when so many factions in our society are giving evidence of a measure of social motivation. (The Social Frontier, January 1937, pp. 110-112.)

In a similar vein, Pearl A. Wanamaker, State superintendent of public instruction of the State of Washington, said in an address before the NEA representative assembly, July 7, 1947:

The best interests of public education are not served by affiliation of the teaching profession with labor. * * *

Teachers, like physicians and lawyers, work in a specialized field with no more relation to one than another area outside that field. * * * Why, then, should members of our profession single out for a special kind of cooperation a part of our population devoted to a special economic viewpoint?

All professions must cooperate with each other and with nonprofessional organizations in joint projects devoted to the Nation's welfare. That is the democratic way. * * *

The NEA stands firm in its objection to organized affiliation of the profession, as a body, with any part of the national life that entertains an exclusive economic, religious, or political point of view. (NEA Journal, Sept. 1947, p. 434.)

In line with the call for professional organization and solidarity here being documented, Dr. Norman Woelfel urged "a united front of radically inclined educators"—Progressive Education, January-February 1934, pages 107-112. He urged that educators "form their defensive lines under the banner of basic convictions, ally themselves with all other social groups of similar orientation among the people, and fight heroically against whatever forces elect to lay down the gauge of battle."

Dr. John L. Childs, exponent of the class approach in the effort to achieve a collectivist society, insisted that "the present conflict of classes presents not only a problem, it also presents a resource"—Social Frontier, June 1936, pages 274-278.

996078-42522

The educators' "struggle for academic freedom and adequate support for the public school" is, in Dr. Childs' judgment, "related to the deepening conflict of class interests in American society." This is obviously so, he believes, because the educators' "experience indicates that not all classes in the economic life of the United States are so situated objectively that they will be inclined to favor this fundamental social reconstruction." Indeed, Dr. Childs adds, "a small, but economically and politically powerful, class of owners is already taking active measures to forestall it."

Conversely, "honest appraisal of conditions convinces him"—the experimental educator—"that certain elements of the population are much more likely to respond to this program of socialization than are others. If, as this movement of workers—farm, factory, office, and professional—gathers momentum, he finds that class cleavages in American life grow sharper, he will not thereby be deterred from continuing his work of political and economic organization."

In Dr. Childs' view, far from being deterred, the teachers should welcome allies in the conflict:

To entertain this end of drastic social reconstruction but to be unwilling to cooperate in developing the means necessary to achieve it is to be guilty of a most nonexperimental mode of behavior.

* * * In my opinion, the chance for a peaceful, orderly transformation of our economy will be increased, not lessened, by an open alliance of professional groups, including educators, with the working class (ibid, pp. 274-8).

In an earlier article, Dr. Childs expressed the belief that—

If the schools are to be kept free to perform their important intellectual function during this period (of transition to an effectual planning society) they will need the support of those groups whose interests will be advanced by the change from capitalism. (The Social Frontier, April 1936, pp. 219-222.)

One of the most remarkable statements with respect to the potential power of the teaching profession and the strategic employment of that power is contained in an editorial bearing the statistical title—"1,105,921"—published in the January 1935 Social Frontier, pages 5-6. The title represents the number

of persons teaching in the schools and colleges of the Nation in 1930 as disclosed by the Fiftieth Federal Census. The fact that one out of every 45 persons gainfully employed was engaged in teaching was described in the editorial as "a fact of far-reaching social significance—a fact whose meaning has been fully grasped neither by society at large nor by the teaching profession."

Elaborating on this significance, the editorial emphasizes the role of teachers as professional specialists:

The responsibility of educational workers for shaping the program of the school has become perpetual and inescapable. They could not be mere instruments if they tried. This is due chiefly to the fact that in the course of the past several generations organized education has developed to a point where it requires in its conduct an enormous and ever-growing body of professional knowledge and experience. In large part, therefore, the actual administration of the school must be left to those who are technically competent—the teachers of the country. The only alternative is chaos and cultural regression.

The next sentence is extremely significant, and it raises the question as to the extent to which the wish is father to the thought:

In the very nature of the case no clear mandate covering the details or even the major outlines of an educational program can be given by society to educational workers.

Elaborating this view, the editorial continues:

Differentiation of function and delegation of responsibility are of the essence of industrial civilization. Increasingly, it would seem, if this civilization is to perdure and develop, the discharge of a particular function will have to be entrusted to the appropriate special group. The inherited conception of Government as a police or regulative agent, external to the economic and social process, is already breaking down under the impact of new forces. In the state now emerging organized education must take its place alongside the other great coordinate functions of industrial society and become an integral part of government.

The conception of organized education as "an integral part of government" when combined with the proposition that "no clear mandate covering even the major outlines of an educational program can be given by society to educa-

tional workers," seems to me to add up to an amazing totalitarian, free-from-accountability - to - anyone - but - themselves role for members of the teaching profession. It is a demand for carte blanche for the profession—the ultimate in a "hands-off" notice to the "educationally incompetent" lay public including, presumably, elected members of boards of education. Successful establishment of such a role for the teaching profession obviously would solve most of the practical difficulties of achieving the envisioned collectivist society through the classroom, provided the advocates of that goal could, in turn, capture control of the teaching profession.

The editorial goes on to deplore the "tragedy that the teachers of the Nation, as a body, are unprepared, in either knowledge, disposition, or organization, to discharge intelligently and effectually the responsibilities which events have placed on their shoulders." And it adds that "to those who say that the profession dare not show independence in the formulation of either educational or social policies, it should be pointed out that the potential power of teachers in terms of today and tomorrow has never been put to the test."

By way of elaborating on this "potential power," the editorial points out that on the basis "of simple numerical strength alone" the members of the teaching profession, "if organized and conscious of their strength, could wield enormous power." The editorial continues:

With the enfranchisement of women the teachers of the country have become a potential political force to be reckoned with. They have the power to throw the fear of God and of unemployment into the hearts of many a machine politician. The Social Frontier is of the opinion that the judicious and courageous use of this power in advancing the interests of education and protecting the civic and professional rights of teachers is a responsibility which they can no longer escape.

A further factor of "potential power"—one of utmost importance—is cited by the editorial:

The strength of the teachers * * * is by no means to be gauged by statistics. Their strength is strategic and functional as well as numerical. They spread over the

country in a fine network which embraces every hamlet and rural community. And the function which they perform brings them into close and sympathetic relations with the rank and file of the people of the Nation. No occupational group in society is equally favorably situated.

As still another "source of strength" of the profession, the editorial cites the fact that membership of the profession as a whole "compasses all fields of knowledge and thought and is thus peculiarly armed to do battle in the contemporary world."

The editorial concludes:

Clearly, if they but utilized the resources within their grasp, teachers could become one of the major forces in American life. Particularly might they aspire to such a position, if they should choose to identify themselves with the masses of the people and refuse longer to make obeisance to the badges of wealth and rank. All they lack is organization, vision, and courage. Perhaps these things will come.

In conjunction with this emphasis on the "potential power" of the teaching profession, I call attention to a proposal to give the public schools a total monopoly on the primary and secondary education of American youth. I sincerely trust that there is no extensive disposition in the circles of professional education to revive and promote this particular, iniquitous proposal. But it cannot pass unmentioned.

In the April 1943 *Frontiers of Democracy*, pages 215-216, an anonymous article was published in the magazine's "What Do You Believe?" section, entitled "Shall We Revive the Oregon School Law?"

The article recalls that some 20 years earlier Oregon had enacted, by referendum, a law establishing the public school as the only available school for all its children between the ages of 8 and 16. The article points out that this law was ruled invalid by the courts, but ventures the belief that "with the new attitude on the United States Supreme Bench there is no certainty that the decision would now be against the law."

The article proposes a Nation-wide Oregon law, which would, of course, ban private or parochial schools for this age group. As arguments for creation of

such an educational monopoly, the article charges that the private—secular—school "exists primarily to shelter the privileged from the common-run" and that "such segregation in the degree present tends to hinder the mutual give-and-take of conference and opinion necessary to the successful operation of a democracy."

So far as the parochial school is concerned, the article contends that it "exists primarily to segregate its school population from assimilative interaction with the rest of the people. Insofar as the parochial school succeeds, it builds a mind different from the common American mind." The article adds:

A democracy depends for its success on discussion, on honest shared search to find out what to think and do. The method of certain parochial schools is dogmatic authority, not shared inquiry; their students, therefore, do not learn how to discuss and inquire and even worse, they acquire such closed minds, such fixed and absolute ideas, that in too large measure they are unable to participate profitably in discussion. The democratic process is closed to them.

This amounts to a claim by one educational group of the right to define the democratic process and to impose its concept of that process upon other groups by law, regardless of contrary educational, political, or religious views. Triumph of such a proposal as a Nation-wide Oregon law would, of course, create an educational monopoly. Presumably it would remove important obstacles to the program of social reconstruction through the classroom. Fortunately there are no grounds for anticipating any extensive public support for such a move.

One other device proposed for offsetting or circumventing public opposition to collectivism via the classroom must be mentioned. I am certain that advocacy of this technique is the rare exception. I refer to the method of slyness or outright deception.

This, of course, is what Dr. Brameld was talking about in his discussion of "Karl Marx and the American Teacher" when he said that teachers favorable to the collectivist philosophy and program "must then influence their students,

subtly if necessary, frankly if possible, toward acceptance of the same position"—*Social Frontier*, November 1935, pages 53-55.

This is also the same method referred to in the instructions to teachers published in the May 1937 issue of "The Communist"—cited, with vigorous condemnation, by V. T. Thayer, education director of the Ethical Culture Schools in his book, *American Education Under Fire*, 1944:

The party must take careful steps to see that all teacher comrades are given thorough education in the teaching of Marxism-Leninism. Only when teachers have really mastered Marxism-Leninism will they be able skillfully to inject it into their teaching at the least risk of exposure.

In view of the fundamental integrity of the overwhelming majority of American educators, it is shocking to find the *Progressive Education* magazine as recently as February 1951 carrying an article advocating outright deceit—apparently without any editorial repudiation of the suggestion. I quote from an article, "Guarding the Freedom To Teach," by A. Max Carmichael, professor of education at Ball State Teachers College, Muncie, Ind.:

I suppose there are cases where teachers live under a constant threat. * * * Our teacher will have to choose whether * * * to try to live up to the principles which he morally can accept, and risk being discharged, or whether * * * to temporize with the situation, abiding actually or ostensibly by the decision of those in control, but here and there, perhaps, secretly failing to abide by the injunction and not stating his position too openly in the wrong places. Some teachers can find moral justification for that latter procedure under these circumstances. It seems to me that the individual teacher will have to make up his mind in terms of the alternatives before him, to wit, how well he can make an adjustment if discharged, how likely he is to get caught, etc. It seems a shame to have to talk in these terms, but one must meet opposition that is without moral principle in ways that implement one's long-time goals rather than the more immediate ones. Ultimately, force may often best be met with force and with its accompanying deceit. Let me here add that so long as no threat of discharge exists, I see no reason for any other behavior than that of candid discussion.

Even in the case of threat, there is little need for innuendoes, name calling, sarcasm, even though there may be occasion for deceit (p. 110).

This is appalling counsel, especially from a professed teacher of teachers. Even more appalling is the apparent failure of the progressive education leadership to repudiate such counsel and its author.

By comparison with this vicious counsel, the final proposal for overcoming public opposition to collectivism-through-the-classroom which I shall document at least has the virtue of forthrightness and integrity.

Many advocates of the reconstruction of the social order via the schoolhouse also call for a corollary campaign for collectivism through adult education.

The practicalities which dictate this proposal are obvious, and were well stated by President Willard W. Beatty, of the *Progressive Education Association*. After pointing out that "schools cannot offer their children instruction in political and economic doctrines which differ materially from those understood and accepted by the adult community," he wrote:

A double burden therefore rests upon the educator who would contribute materially to social planning. He must be prepared to undertake not only the instruction of children for their share in a new order, but also leadership and guidance of the adult community in its groping for individual and social security in this rapidly changing world. (*Progressive Education*, October 1933, p. 304.)

Prof. Harold Rugg, who for 20 years has been the most zealous advocate of such a program of adult education, expressed the "need" in terms of the creation of "an informed climate of opinion by a dramatic Nation-wide campaign for social reconstruction." He insisted that "this step is a necessary preliminary to the rebuilding of the social-science program of the elementary and secondary schools," since "these, too, are molded by the dominant climate of opinion in the community"—*Progressive Education*, January-February 1934, pages 3-5.

Earlier, in *The Great Technology*, 1933, Dr. Rugg insisted that "the remark-

ing of minority opinion in American life is fundamental to the reconstruction of public opinion," page 203. It is curious that this exponent of democracy constantly talked in terms of a "thinking minority," which he usually estimated in terms of some 25,000,000 people.

Dr. Rugg's advocacy of such a program of adult education reached a climax unequalled before or since, when, in 1942, he addressed open letters to President Roosevelt, United States Commissioner of Education John Studebaker, and to public-school superintendents of the Nation, under the resounding title, "The Battle for Consent: Gentlemen, This Is Our Moment—If."

It called for an all-out, high pressure, Government-sponsored, financed, and directed campaign of adult and youth education designed to "redirect social trend," to wage a "war-at-home over a free, abundant, and creative world," to promote world rehabilitation and "full employment at abundance level." The social program thus to be promoted included economic planning by Government, "interjection of social capital into the system" by Government "if private initiative does not act promptly to maintain full employment," and the proposition that "with our giant resources we need not fear the national debt."

In his letter to the President, Dr. Rugg said that educators who have reached "much the same conclusions and affirmations, more than all else crave a chance to teach these great ideas to their high school youths and to the prospective teachers in the colleges of education. They want to write them into the new textbooks that will be made to herald the new day"—Frontiers of Democracy, December 1942, pages 75-81.

He said that "to do that would be a thrilling experience" and added:

I know, for I tried to do it during the great depression in my Man and His Changing Society—a series of books which was studied by some 5,000,000 young Americans until the patrioteers and the native Fascist press well-nigh destroyed it between 1939 and 1941.

Dr. Rugg called for creation of an office of education for peace, with "unlimited resources," with "a budget running into billions if necessary, to reach

ten, twenty, thirty million Americans day after day, week after week, without let-up."

In his letter to Dr. Studebaker he called for "an all-out campaign over every trunk line of communication in this country, a Nation-wide barrage of ideas and attitudes that will reach every city, town, and hamlet—a barrage day after day, month after month, not letting up for years to come."

To carry out this program, "the Government must get access to national radio and movie newsreel chains, to the movie houses, to syndicate space in the newspapers, to 200,000 secondary and college teachers and their classrooms and their curricula."

More than that, "the Government must be ready to print and sell at a nickel or a dime hundreds of pamphlets and bulletins in 10,000,000 lots." Further outlining his program, he wrote:

This campaign requires a pamphlet-bulletin-article-book-writing program that would dwarf anything that has ever been dreamed of in this or any other country. The Nation's finest novelists, poets, essayists, columnists, and other publicists, drafted to write. Drafted, I say. The Nation's scholars in the social sciences—economics, politics, government, history and sociology, social psychology and public opinion—drafted to organize topics, to outline material, to collaborate with the professional writers in preparing books, pamphlets, bulletins, articles printed by Government printing presses and syndicated at cost throughout the country.

He insisted that "the time is short" because with the end of the war "the incipient fascism that is latent in most of our communities today could quickly and virulently infect the social blood stream of our country; it could utterly strangle our treasured democratic process and turn your teachers and youth into fear-some parrots of an authoritarian regime." In a later article—Frontiers of Democracy, January 1943, pages 101-108—he again warned:

There may not be time enough * * * to silence the isolationist, exploitive, back-to-normalcy, die-hard right and their vicious press.

This fantastic, grandiose proposal was snubbed by President Roosevelt. Com-

missioner Studebaker aptly pointed out that "political democracy in the United States requires that orderly means of ascertaining the collective judgment and will of the people be secured through the mechanism of political parties, political campaigns, and free elections."—*Frontiers of Democracy*, March 1943, pages 172-175. Reluctantly, Dr. Rugg thereafter wrote:

I am unhappy to report that the hoped-for attack from Washington has not been forthcoming. * * * I very much fear that as in the past we shall be driven back upon private initiative to take the lead. (*Frontiers of Democracy*, May 1943, pp. 246-254).

And he issued a significant summons to colleges of education:

Let them become powerful national centers for the graduate study of ideas and they will thereby become forces of creative imagination standing at the very vortex of the ideational revolution. Let us make our teacher education institutions into great direction-finders for our new society * * * pointers of the way * * * dynamic trail blazers of new frontiers (*ibidem*).

The hope dies hard—the hope of achieving the longed-for social reconstruction through the schools, through adult education, through teacher-training colleges. Indeed, the hope does not die. Despite temporary set-backs and disappointments, it stubbornly persists.

X. CHANGING OUR FORM OF GOVERNMENT

Fundamental changes in the philosophy and procedures of American Government are, of course, implicit in the very concept of collectivism and socialization being documented herein.

In addition, the movement here being described has produced numerous by-products and offshoots in the way of subsidiary and auxiliary proposals for changes in the philosophy and procedures of American Government. These proposals and ideas are all grist for the mill for the educators who seek to achieve a new social order through the schools.

Space forbids more than a brief cataloging of a few of these proposals and ideas. They represent a part of the indoctrination of teachers, and, presumably through the teachers, of children designed to prepare them for the new day.

One premise, stated early in the history of this movement, is that "Democracy should not be identified with political forms and functions—with the Federal Constitution, the popular election of officials, or the practice of universal suffrage"—Counts', "Dare the Schools Create a New Social Order?" page 40 ff. And Dr. Counts adds, "the most genuine expression of democracy in the United States has little to do with our political institutions: It is a sentiment with respect to the moral equality of man; it is an aspiration toward a society in which this sentiment will find complete fulfillment."

Dr. Counts later came to attach much greater importance to the political forms and functions of the American Government—"Education and the Promise of America," 1945. But in this earlier view he was opening the way for reckless advocacy of changes in forms of Government, supposed to serve the ends of social reconstruction.

This premise leads, logically, to the view expressed by Dr. Rugg in *The Great Technology*, that we must "build systematically the attitude among the young people of the world that the trend toward representative democracy has produced nothing more than important experiments in Government." Likewise, they must be taught that "every form of Government on earth today must be regarded frankly as an experiment, tentative, and to be changed as new social and economic conditions develop"—page 270.

This encouragement, through the schools, of a flippant, lighthearted, and casual attitude toward government and the basic principles of government, yields some fantastic byproducts.

One, of course, is the glib acceptance of big government, especially at the Federal level.

For example, "fear of centralized governmental administration and control" is dismissed as a "bogeyman," not because a trend in that direction does not exist, but because the trend is inevitable and even desirable. Thus Arnold E. Joyal, professor of educational administration at the University of Maryland—*Frontiers of Democracy*, February 1941—argues that there is nothing to fear in this

"inevitable trend" if people only "realize that the Federal Government is as much our Government as is the State or the city or the school district. It is capable of functioning only with our sanction."

With this glibly experimentalist attitude, it is no surprise to find Stuart Chase, writing in the May 1934, *NEA Journal*, page 147, that one of the changes required by an abundance economy is "the scrapping of outworn political boundaries and of constitutional checks and balances where the issues involved are technical."

Similarly we find the John Dewey Society yearbook, "Teacher and Society," sympathetically proposing regular 10-year conventions for revision of State and Federal constitutions; removal of the power of the Supreme Court to declare acts of Congress unconstitutional, and "a change in our constitutional pattern which would eliminate State boundaries and set up a system of representation based primarily on economic and geographic regions"—page 174 ff.

Again we have the proposal that the United States Supreme Court have a "substantial minority" membership of laymen—that is, nonlawyers—with the suggestion of the name of Henry Wallace as one lay Justice—telegram to President Roosevelt from the directors of the Social Frontier and the fellows of the John Dewey Society, February 21, 1937, the *Social Frontier*, April 1937, pages 197-8.

There is also the denunciation by the late Dr. William H. Kilpatrick of the "threefold governmental arrangement of President, Senate, and House" as "a misconceived system," because it "embodies inherent conflict where there should be inherent cooperation"—*Frontiers of Democracy*, March 1943, pages 164, 165. One wonders as to the qualifications for grounding the younger generation in the basic principles of our Government system possessed by a teacher or by a teacher-of-teachers with such views.

Then as a further example, there is the theory advanced in the book, *New Schools for a New Culture*—Charles M. MacConnell, Ernest O. Melby, and Christian O. Arndt. In a chapter, appropriately titled "Sailing for Utopia," it argues that "de-

mocracy has little to do with majority rule." True democracy operates, according to the authors' theory, through the process of "consensus"—agreement reached through discussion in small groups. This theory holds that the "action bodies" of government "must be reduced to a size that they may act with efficiency and dispatch in times of emergency or crisis," and adds that "Congress and many State legislatures have long outgrown such specifications."

Under the Utopian scheme envisioned, "war and other national emergencies may still have to be handled by a small national deliberative body," but the great bulk of less urgent problems would be handled by the consensus method through a "hierarchy of deliberative bodies," extending from the grass roots to the national level (p. 196 ff.).

Still another device proposed under this experimentalist approach to the business of government is the development of "do-democracy" through the medium of citizens' advisory committees, working with elected administrative officials, which, it is held, would open up "opportunities for a large number of citizens to participate directly in government." (*Practical Applications of Democracy*, George de Huszar, page 44, 1945.) The question of how responsible public officials could thus delegate authority and responsibility imposed by law, or how these committees could in turn lawfully accept the authority and responsibility, is not too clear. Possibility that the citizen committee-method of government might become a source of serious conflict and confusion when undertaken on this basis, should be obvious.

Much more serious are some of the proposed changes in the basic philosophy relating to the powers of Government, especially in the realm of freedom of speech and press.

Thus we have Kenneth D. Benne, professor of education at the University of Illinois—*Progressive Education*, May 1949—depicting teachers and school administrators as "social engineers" and "change agents."

And we have the amazing proposition that—

The engineering of change must be anti-individualistic, yet provide for the establishment of appropriate areas of privacy and for

the development of persons as creative units of influence in our society.

Dr. Enne regards as "unscientific" the concept of "natural rights" of man. Moreover, "human rights and duties are grounded in the institutions and ideologies of a culture, not in a nature independent of man's social relationship."

Accordingly:

That a wise social policy will establish areas of privacy for persons and voluntary associations within the society is undoubtedly true. In such areas private judgment may rule. But the determination of the proper boundaries of these areas must, in an interdependent society, be based on a collective judgment.

It would take some doing to rewrite the Bill of Rights on the basis of such a political and social philosophy.

The extent to which the Bill of Rights is at issue in this whole movement is well illustrated by the series of articles by Dr. Norman Woelfel, professor of education at Ohio State University, on "Communications," in the October 1945 and January, February, and May 1946 issues of *Progressive Education*.

The philosophy underlying these articles is epitomized in his discussion of the newspaper, which he regards as merely a mirror of "the peculiar ideological idiosyncracies of an owning and ruling class."

Dr. Woelfel offers the startling conclusion that:

It may be necessary, paradoxically enough, for us to control our press as the Russian press is controlled and as the Nazi press was controlled. However, even if this were truly the only way out it is not "control" that we should fear, for we already have a very vicious type of control. We need only to look carefully at the objective in whose name control is exercised. Democratic objectives are open, intelligent, creative; they are pointed at the welfare of every individual and at the realization of a great common culture. Surely we could have nothing to fear from a press controlled to reflect, realize, and glorify such objectives. (*Progressive Education*, May 1946, p. 266 ff.)

The control proposed by Dr. Woelfel would take the form of "continuing national, regional, and local controlling boards on which the consumer, the journalist, and the educator are represented" (*ibid.*).

Not content with "capturing" the public schools, Dr. Woelfel and his fellow

educators insist that control of the press, radio, and cinema cannot be left to "their owners and their hiring practitioners if we wish social salvation."

A great many Americans are likely to conclude that the price of salvation, as set by Dr. Woelfel, is impossibly high.

XI. QUIZ GAME FOR TEACHERS AND PUPILS

Since, under the educational movement here being documented, teachers are envisioned as "engineers of social change," it is only natural that the leaders of the movement should be interested in the political-economic-social views of members of the profession. Particularly there is an interest in the presence or absence of so-called liberal views among the teachers.

This interest is graphically illustrated by a survey of teachers' views on such subjects conducted in 1936 by the John Dewey Society for the Study of Education and Culture.

This survey and its findings are described in the society's first yearbook, issued in 1937, in the chapter, "The Social Attitudes and Information of American Teachers," written by Dr. George W. Hartmann, associate professor of education, Teachers College, Columbia University.

In opening the discussion of this survey, Dr. Hartmann offers this thesis:

Any system of public education that seeks to equip the Nation's youth for effective participation in the life of a complex society cannot be indifferent to the social, political, economic, and general philosophic attitudes of its teachers. * * * We cannot doubt that the teacher's personal acceptance or rejection of significant institutional practices and proposals has at least some influence upon the actions and opinions of his pupils and consequently upon the thoughts and behavior of future citizens of the country. * * * In a period of rapid social change the particular attitudes of the teacher lose whatever irrelevancy they may have appeared to possess in a stabler era and become instead crucial matters for urgent consideration (pp. 174 ff.).

One phase of this survey was the circulation among 9,300 junior and senior high school teachers of the country of a "testing instrument" listing 106 propositions to which the teacher was asked to express agreement or dissent. According to Dr. Hartmann, usable results were obtained from 3,700 persons, or about a 40-percent return. Returns, of course, were unsigned.

Most significant is the fact that in publishing the tabulated returns, Dr. Hartmann indicated the "liberal" and therefore the desired answer, for each proposition and rated the replies by this liberal criterion.

This quiz game for teachers is cited for obvious reasons. Efforts of lay citizens or organizations to determine the political views of teachers would rightfully be condemned. As long as the teacher keeps his political and economic prejudices out of the classroom, they must rightfully be regarded as his own private affair—exactly as are his religious views. I agree, of course, with the comparatively recent official NEA position that membership in the Communist Party is quite a different thing and properly disqualifies a person from being a public-school teacher.

996078—42522

Moreover, the first to condemn inquiries as to teachers' political or economic views would be the so-called liberal educators—if the inquiries came from outside "busybodies, patrioteers, American Fascists," and so forth. Yet in this 1936 survey the liberal educators not only canvassed the teachers' political and economic views but rated them as acceptable or unacceptable, on the basis of their conformity to the "liberal" line.

Nothing more clearly reveals the effort to capture and employ the schools for the collectivist ideology than this example of interest in the teachers' views.

Following are samples of the 106 propositions included in the testing instrument and the tabulations of the replies. Note particularly, the slanted character and obvious implications of many of these propositions, and also the listing of the preferred or "liberal" view as indicated in the column headed "Key":

Distribution of opinion among high-school teachers with respect to some of the major political, economic, and educational issues facing contemporary American society

[The column headed "Key" gives the "liberal" answer: P means plus, or agreement; M means minus, or disagreement]

| | Per- cent marked plus | Per- cent marked minus | Per- cent omit- ted | Key | | Per- cent marked plus | Per- cent marked minus | Per- cent omit- ted | Key |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|-----|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|-----|
| Education should develop among its beneficiaries a disposition to participate ethically and intelligently in the solution of social problems..... | 100 | 0 | 0 | P | No person should be permitted to have an income of more than \$25,000 a year until such time as the average wage earner receives at least \$2,000 a year..... | 51 | 48 | 1 | P |
| Capitalism is immoral because it exploits the worker by failing to give him the full value of his productive labor..... | 40 | 58 | 2 | P | Cheaper electric light and power could be had if the industry were owned and operated by governmental units..... | 75 | 24 | 1 | P |
| The general calling of citizens for the revision of State and national constitutions at 10-year intervals would eliminate some of the country's social lag..... | 68 | 30 | 1 | P | Transport service would deteriorate if all railroads were owned and managed by the Federal Government or one of its agencies..... | 34 | 65 | 1 | M |
| A classroom teacher should make every effort to convert his pupils from discovering his position on controversial issues..... | 38 | 62 | 0 | M | We need a Government marketing corporation empowered to buy and process farm products and to sell them here and abroad..... | 47 | 51 | 2 | P |
| A policy of maximum international cooperation is morally superior to national isolation from world affairs..... | 90 | 10 | 0 | P | The coal mines of the Nation should be taken over by a public agency and run for the benefit of all the people..... | 50 | 49 | 1 | P |
| The United States Supreme Court should be deprived of its power to declare acts of Congress unconstitutional..... | 19 | 80 | 1 | P | All foreign trade should be a monopoly of the Federal Government..... | 22 | 76 | 1 | P |
| Our national health would suffer if physicians were made civil servants like the public-school teachers and placed on the Government payroll..... | 30 | 69 | 1 | M | No government has a right to experiment with different social policies..... | 16 | 83 | 1 | M |
| Persons who wish to bring about a "New Social Order" make poorer teachers than those who adhere strictly to their own specialty..... | 34 | 65 | 1 | M | All banks and insurance companies should be run on a nonprofit basis like the schools..... | 35 | 64 | 1 | P |
| Indoctrination by conservatives plays a smaller part in American schools today than radical propaganda. It is pedagogically unprofitable to discuss serious social problems with adolescent youngsters..... | 16 | 83 | 1 | M | The best way to secure decent homes for most of the people will be for the Government to build them for its citizens on a large scale basis..... | 41 | 58 | 1 | P |
| A satisfying life for the masses of people can be secured without introducing important economic changes..... | 24 | 75 | 1 | M | All farm mortgages should be assumed by the Federal Treasury at an interest rate not in excess of 1 percent..... | 28 | 70 | 2 | P |
| Income and social usefulness are closely correlated at the present time..... | 47 | 51 | 2 | M | Most of the undesirable features of the newspapers, the movies, and the radio come from their being controlled by profit-making corporations..... | 68 | 32 | 0 | P |
| The smooth functioning of a profit economy depends upon either natural or artificial scarcity..... | 58 | 30 | 3 | P | The largest possible amount of business competition is necessary to national wealth..... | 40 | 60 | 0 | M |
| Most of the 10,000,000 or more unemployed will never again find steady work at good wages in a capitalist society..... | 49 | 50 | 1 | P | The Federal Government should provide all classes of people opportunity for complete insurance against accident, sickness, unemployment, premature death, and old age..... | 11 | 88 | 1 | M |
| Production for use and present-day capitalism are incompatible systems..... | 53 | 44 | 3 | P | If we had to choose between German fascism and Russian communism, I should prefer the former..... | 66 | 33 | 1 | P |
| Adequate economic security for all is impossible under a laissez faire system..... | 72 | 25 | 3 | P | Genuine individual liberty will flourish under socialism as it never did before..... | 41 | 53 | 6 | M |
| | | | | | Public business enterprises are always inefficient..... | 18 | 81 | 1 | P |
| | | | | | | 12 | 88 | 0 | M |

For most people the opportunity to exercise beneficial personal initiative would be increased by life in a socialist state.

The greater the amount of governmental control over anything, the greater the increase in graft.

The formation of a comprehensive anticapitalist Farmer-Labor political party in the United States would contribute greatly to our social progress.

There is nothing fundamentally wrong with our society; all we need to do is to introduce a few reforms which will correct abuses and make some institutions more humane.

If the best possibilities of the American tradition are to be realized, a new social order qualitatively different from private capitalism must be built.

An improved American nation will result from step-by-step advances in the socialization of the means of production and distribution.

There is no such thing as a "class struggle" in America life today.

A classless society is possible.

A classless society is desirable.

Whenever great social needs require it, the ruling class will always be found willing to surrender some of its privileges in order to meet them.

Capitalism can be abolished only through a violent seizure of power by anticapitalists.

If we put capable men into office, most of our social problems would be solved.

The less government the better.

No economic system can function efficiently without appealing to the desire for private profits.

Teachers have a moral obligation to remain rigorously neutral on all debatable issues both in class and out.

NOTE.—A "liberal" answer, as defined by the key, was given by a majority of the teachers replying on 78 of the 106 questions.

A similar type of opinion test was developed and used as part of an educational experiment conducted in the Floodwood, Minn., high school, under the auspices of the University of Minnesota. This experiment is described by its director, Dr. Theodore Brameld, in his book, "Design for America" (1945). It was part of the collectivist educational movement and was termed by Dr. Brameld "an educational exploration of the

996078—42522

The best form of society is one in which an intelligent and forceful elite rules over the stabilized masses.

Although some persons take advantage of it for unworthy ends, at bottom our industry is organized on a fundamentally ethical basis.

I believe that the United States is just as selfish as any other nation.

All social planning leads to human regimentation.

As the economic crisis lengthens and deepens, society tends to divide into 2 mutually opposed sections.

It is as difficult for a man of property to support basic social change as for a camel to go through the eye of a needle.

The behavior of the capitalists is doing more to discredit and undermine capitalism than all of the activities of anticapitalistic groups.

The exceptional wealth of the United States is the result of our continued loyalty to the capitalist system.

A system that has worked as well as capitalism has in this country for the last 150 years should not be changed now.

Teachers should affiliate with some genuine labor organization of their own choosing.

Contemporary school practice generally develops a fixity of outlook which hampers social readjustment.

Economic individualism is more appropriate to contemporary America than any proposed form of collectivism.

Whenever social ownership is substituted for private ownership, at least partial compensation for the value of the property transferred should be made.

35 64 1 M

71 28 1 M

61 38 1 P

32 67 1 M

81 18 1 P

40 59 1 P

71 27 2 P

33 64 3 M

32 66 2 M

37 62 1 P

44 55 1 P

63 34 3 M

93 6 1 P

future of democracy for senior high schools and junior colleges."

This test was used with pupils participating in the Floodwood experiment. It likewise involved a series of propositions to be affirmed or denied. And here again the returns were rated on the basis of the liberal or preferred answers.

Following are typical statements with the preferred answers indicated in parentheses after each proposition:

There should be Government ownership and control of radio stations. (Affirm.)

Liberal interpretation of the Constitution has permitted too great expansion of the powers of the Federal Government. (Deny.)

If European countries want to establish left-wing governments after the war, we should support them. (Affirm.)

A program to legalize and educate for birth control should be instituted in the Nation. (Affirm.)

The power of unions should be curtailed. (Deny.)

America has never been interested in imperialistic gains. (Deny.)

Should any plan of socialized medicine be established, the caliber and the ability of the medical profession would fall. (Deny.)

Family life is in need of no change in its traditional form. (Deny.)

What this country needs is more TVA's. (Affirm.)

If the creed of the postwar world be the betterment of the common man, then it follows that public medicine should become a main part of that program. (Affirm.)

If medical care is to be made available to all families at costs they can afford, these costs must be shared by all. (Affirm.)

The Federal Government should finance Government projects for the advancement of the arts. (Affirm.)

The Constitution needs some radical modifications. (Affirm.)

There is need of a change in our constitutional pattern which would eliminate State boundaries and set up a system of representation based primarily on economic and geographical regions. (Affirm.)

There is too much bureaucracy in Government already. (Deny.)

Our economic base must be shifted from rugged individualism to economic planning. (Affirm.)

The chain of middlemen that connects the producer with the consumer is unnecessary. (Affirm.)

The more State authority and the less Federal authority, the better. (Deny.)

Unless business makes a profit, the worker will be unemployed. (Deny.)

Economic planning and control of production by Government could never eliminate depressions and unemployment. (Deny.)

Without individual competition for profits, our economy would slow up and soften. (Deny.)

Income taxes on the rich should be greatly increased. (Affirm.)

Wealth should be much more equally distributed. (Affirm.)

The Government should take over much larger areas of northern Minnesota iron mines now entirely in private hands. (Affirm.)

XII. A NEW "CALL" AND A NEW STRATEGY

To a large extent the Second World War, and the tasks and problems which it posed for public education, diverted the attention of educators from the program of social reconstruction through the schools. This was true even of the most outspoken advocates of that program.

Testimony to this fact is provided in a postwar statement of policy adopted by the American Education Fellowship—the new, euphemistic title of the Progressive Education Association—at its Chicago convention, November 29, 1947.

This policy statement reviewed the reform movement of the thirties, cited its eclipse during the war period, and issued what was, in effect, a new "call" to the teachers of the Nation. I quote from this document—Progressive Education, February 1948, pages 33, 40–41, 46, 58:

Memories are not so short as to forget the economic events following World War I—the years of reckless prosperity and high living, of growing corporate power and disparities of wealth, followed by years of devastating depression, hunger, fear, and waste of human resources. During the thirties some American educators became sufficiently concerned to voice their anger at this tragedy through the pages of one journal, the *Social Frontier*, and through the volumes of the Commission on the Social Studies—American Historical Association. They courageously analyzed the failures of a system which could cause such havoc, and they demanded fundamental changes to eliminate those failures. Yet, as the depression waned and the Nation became preoccupied with winning of World War II, even their voices softened to a whisper. It was almost as if those theorists were right who have said that education is always chiefly a reflector of the social order—rather than its critic, leader, and recreator.

This declaration of policy of the American Education Fellowship is significant on many counts. Perhaps its greatest significance lies in the fact that it was officially adopted, first by the board of directors of the AEF and then by the delegates at the Chicago convention, and subsequently was submitted to a vote of the AEF membership. The policy statement was approved by a majority of the mail ballots returned. It will be recalled that the original "Call to the Teachers of the Nation," while drafted and approved by a committee of the Progressive Education Association, was never formally adopted by either the PEA board or its membership—a fact which the association's president emphasized at the time the original "Call" was published. Thus the postwar policy statement has an official status lacking in the earlier pronouncement. To that extent it is a bolder action and a more significant pronouncement than the original "Call."

The "new call" also reflects a new strategy in the social-reconstruction-through-the-schools movement, a strategy of euphemism, double-talk, more guarded phraseology, and more cautious commitments. That undoubtedly was due, in part, to the necessity of modifications in order to find a broad basis of

consensus and agreement within the larger group. We know, from a sympathetic report on the session at which the policy statement was adopted, that there were those in the group who were concerned lest the statement "commit the AEF to an advocacy of a socialistic economy"—Progressive Education, January 1948, Report on the National Conference, Archibald W. Anderson, assistant professor of education, University of Illinois.

Whether the final document avoided such a commitment is a matter of opinion. But it obviously provided a common ground, or a common roof, for those who, at one extreme, do advocate socialism and those who either do not advocate socialism or do not want to appear to the public or their colleagues in the teaching profession as advocates of socialism.

By fortunate circumstance, we are given an insight into the evolution of this particular document which is most enlightening. The AEF policy committee, of which Dean Ernest O. Melby, of the New York University School of Education, was chairman, designated Dr. Theodore Brameld, perhaps the most radical of the present-day leaders of the social-reconstruction-through-the-schools movement, to prepare the draft of the statement of policy for submission to the Chicago convention. Dr. Brameld's first draft was carried in full in the November 1946 issue of *Progressive Education*.

According to Professor Anderson's report on the Chicago convention, Dr. Brameld's original draft was discussed at length by the AEF board of directors and by delegates in the opening days of the Chicago meeting. Anderson adds:

They—

The directors—

appointed a committee to attempt certain modifications which seemed desirable. It was this modified form which was finally presented to the conference as a whole.

The official statement of policy, as adopted by the Chicago convention, was published in full in the February 1948 *Progressive Education*.

A sentence-by-sentence analysis and comparison of the original and final drafts is most enlightening. It discloses the attempt to modify the more extreme and forthright Brameld statement of policy to satisfy the apprehensions of more conservative, or at least more cau-

tious, members. It also discloses, as I shall point out, that the camouflage operation was something less than perfect. There are numerous obvious give-away bare spots in the final product.

Following is an analysis of the most important portions of the policy statement:

First. The statement cites approvingly the trends, outside the United States, toward increasing public controls over "economic processes" and deplors the failure of this country to match these trends.

The following paragraph was adopted in the final draft unchanged from the original Brameld draft:

In only one great respect—though a most crucial one—the present decade differs from the twenties. While America seems to have learned little from its recent economic experience, other parts of the world have learned much. All over the earth powerful movements of the common people are demanding that these absurd and destructive fluctuations of the industrial system should end—that public controls be exerted over economic processes of sufficient strength and rationality to guarantee stability, much greater equalization of wealth, and the securities of a rising standard of living which the proven potentialities of abundance make entirely feasible.

The next paragraph shows the following interesting change:

Brameld draft: "America is out of step with the world."

Final statement: "Since the end of the war, America has shown a singular reluctance either to take cognizance of the democratic nature of these movements or to deal with the serious social problems which have called them forth."

Second. The original and final drafts also show some significant changes in the wording of the two major policy declarations of the American Education Fellowship.

Brameld draft: "The two great constructive purposes which should now govern the AEF follow directly from this brief analysis. They are:

"I. To channel the energies of education toward the reconstruction of the economic system—a system which should be geared with the increasing socializations and public controls now developing in England, Sweden, New Zealand, and other countries; a system in which national and international planning of production and distribution replaces the chaotic planlessness of traditional 'free enterprise'; a system in which the interests, wants and needs of the consumer dominate those of the producer; a system in which natural resources, such as coal and iron ore, are

owned and controlled by the people; a system in which public corporations replace monopolistic enterprises and privately owned public utilities; a system in which Federal authority is synchronized with decentralized regional and community administration; a system in which social security and a guaranteed annual wage sufficient to meet scientific standards of nourishment, shelter, clothing, health, recreation, and education are universalized; a system in which the majority of the people is the sovereign determinant of every basic economic policy."

Final statement: "As a result of the analysis made above, two great constructive purposes have first claim for active support.

"1. The reconstruction of the economic system in the direction of far greater justice and stability; a system to be secured by whatever democratic planning and social controls experience shows to be necessary; a system in which social security and a guaranteed annual wage sufficient to meet scientific standards of nourishment, shelter, clothing, health, recreation, and education are universalized; a system in which the will of the majority with due regard for the interests of all the people is the sovereign determinant of every basic economic policy."

Brameld draft: "II. To channel the energies of education toward the establishment of genuine international authority in all crucial issues affecting peace and security; an order therefore in which all weapons of war (including atomic energy, first of all) and police forces are finally under that authority; an order in which international economic planning of trade, resources, labor distribution and standards is practiced parallel with the best standards of individual nations; an order in which all nationalities, races, and religions receive equal rights in its democratic control; an order in which 'world citizenship' thus assumes at least equal status with national citizenship."

Final statement: "2. The establishment of a genuine world order, an order in which national sovereignty is subordinate to world authority in all crucial interests affecting peace and security; an order therefore in which all weapons of war and police forces are finally under that authority; an order in which international economic coordination of trade, resources, labor and standards parallels the best practices of individual nations; an order geared with the increasing socializations and public controls now developing in England, Sweden, New Zealand and certain other countries; an order in which all nationals, races, and religions receive equal rights; an order in which 'world citizenship' thus assumes at least equal status with national citizenship."

It will be noted that the Brameld draft, as cited above, calls explicitly for advocacy of Socialism, which he defines in detail. This detailed proposal of Socialism is omitted from the final draft.

But note this: whereas the Brameld proposal to gear the economic system "with the increasing socializations and public controls now developing in England, Sweden, New Zealand, and other countries" appears in the section calling for "reconstruction of the economic system" in the United States, the final draft shifts this endorsement of "the increasing socializations and public controls now developing in England, and so forth" to the section of the policy statement dealing with "international economic coordination." Just how this felocation of this phrase makes the document any less an endorsement of Socialistic principles and methods is a puzzling question, to say the least. The Socialistic slip still plainly shows beneath the verbal outer-garments of the revised document.

Third. The sections of the two drafts dealing with the question of "classroom indoctrination" are interesting. I cite these sections:

Brameld version: "In 'taking sides' against the unworkable economic system and unworkable nationalism, and with a workable system and workable internationalism, there is need to develop consciousness of a distinction between the convictions already held by those who take such sides and those who do not yet do so. This is necessary in order thereby to permit development of new educational techniques of learning through social agreement, not by superimposing prejudgments. Only thus can majority rule eventually become rule by an informed majority who understand what they want and how democratically to get what they want. The school should become a center of experimentation in attaining communities of uncoerced persuasion."

Final statement: "In implementing the above outlook there should be no attempt to indoctrinate for any political party or for any given economic system. It is vital to maintain democratic intelligent discussion and decision but also to make sure that the process will lead to conclusions. This can only be done by informed teachers who have convictions of their own—convictions which they do not foist upon their students but which at appropriate age levels they share with students. The task is to experiment with techniques of learning which look toward intelligent social consensus, not to superimpose prejudgments or dogmatic doctrines. Only thus can majority rule eventually become rule by an informed majority who understand what they want and how, democratically, to get what they want. The school should become a center of experimentation in attaining communities of uncoerced persuasion."

The original Brameld draft includes a concluding paragraph which was deleted from the final policy statement. It said:

To prove that education is not a mere mirror of dominant ideologies, not a device for bolstering outmoded economic systems and diseased nationalisms, but rather that education is a penetrating critic, dynamic leader, and imaginative recreator which anticipates dangers before they crystallize into calamities, which helps simultaneously to reshape the culture of America and the world in accordance with the imperatives of our revolutionary age—this is the supreme obligation of the American Education Fellowship in our time. This is its new policy.

Regardless of the professed repudiation of indoctrination, the policy declaration makes clear that certain "conclusions" by the pupils are desired as the result of the educational process.

Fourth. One other deletion from the Brameld draft is particularly noteworthy. Citing the alleged contradictions in public-school teaching regarding foreign affairs, the original and final drafts contain this identical wording:

They (schools) may study and endorse the United Nations, to be sure; and that is helpful. But they seldom face the contradiction between high-minded objectives for all nations and the still dominant power of sovereignty of each nation. Students are taught that internationalism is desirable; they are also taught that the United States is supreme in its own right. They are taught that all countries must cooperate; they are also taught that we should keep the secret of atomic energy. They are taught that we should support the efforts of common peoples in other parts of the world to rise in power; they are also taught to be uncritical of a foreign policy (which) when it serves to thwart those efforts.

In the original Brameld draft, the last sentence of the foregoing included seven additional words, so that it concluded:

They are also taught to be uncritical of a foreign policy which serves to thwart those efforts in countries like Greece, China, and Spain.

Obviously, the counsels of caution in the Chicago convention dictated that the AEF policy statement should not include this specific mention of Greece, China, and Spain which paralleled the then prevalent Communist line.

Fifth. That the new AEF policy statement—regardless of its cautious double-talk—constitutes a new "call" to teacher activity and effort, in and out of the classroom, in support of increasing social

controls and subordination of the United States to world government, is made clear by other sections of the draft finally adopted. Thus the final draft adds this paragraph to the original version:

Inasmuch as the forces that shape society are those that determine education as well, educators should understand what is taking place in the community, and should take stands as adult citizens on controversial issues of the day. It is their right and duty to participate actively in political and economic life.

Both the original and final drafts also declared that the "two great guiding principles"—those mentioned above—"involve a multitude of specific educational tasks to which the AEF should now devote itself." That these tasks relate to the curriculum and the classroom is made clear in the final draft, which varies only in minor details from the Brameld version:

Their precise delineation should involve every member and the closest cooperation with all groups and forces which share generally in its purposes. In this statement of policy, it is possible only to suggest what some of these tasks may be.

1. A subject of first importance in the re-constructed curriculum is the careful study of evolving economic and political systems characterized by developments both in our own country and in other countries.

2. Of great importance also is the study of both the successes and failures of attempts to move toward genuine world order.

3. As indicated above there is desperate need to prepare realistic materials regarding the economic system, and for skill in penetrating propaganda.

4. There is need to develop consciousness in students, teachers, administrators, and other citizens of the meaning and content of the values which should govern new social arrangements and purposes.

5. There should be extensive educational practice in building detailed social designs which come to grips with problems arising in, for example, social planning. Intensive study is needed of experiments and institutions already under way, such as the Tennessee Valley Authority, the postal system, the consumer cooperative movement, the social-security programs of America and Europe. Psychological problems such as motivations and incentives; political problems such as bureaucracy and reorganization of State and Federal Governments; social problems such as neighborhood life and the role of women; economic problems such as the place of private property in an evolving democracy—

Incidentally, in the Brameld draft, the phrase "increasingly socialized order"

was used instead of "an evolving democracy"—

problems of civil rights such as those raised by the President's committee on civil rights—these are equally pressing.

The finally approved draft also revived the appeal for adult education along the lines of the social reconstruction program:

Vital education of the adult population at the "grass roots" should occupy a place of importance comparable to education of youth, and should include all the issues exemplified above.

Sixth, the document as finally adopted proposes close cooperation and affiliation with other educational organizations. It urges that the AEF "seek to influence" these organizations "to experiment with its new materials and methods." It cites particularly UNESCO, and urges AEF to "push for recognition by the U. N. of the need to lift UNESCO above its present purely advisory status."

With respect to other educational organizations in the United States, the policy statement says:

Cooperation with the United States Office of Education is also important, looking toward crystallization of its own objectives and toward the provision of more authority to assist in improving the public schools. The National Education Association, American Federation of Teachers, Association for Childhood Education, and American Association for Adult Education should learn of the new AEF program, and should consider its reformulated ends and means just as they have done during the earlier period of AEF history.

The policy statement as adopted calls on the AEF to "support the democratic potentialities of the labor movement, the consumer cooperative movement, and quasi-political groups of sufficiently similar intent." Significantly, an additional phrase, "such as the Political Action Committee and Union for Democratic Action," which appeared in the Brameld draft, was deleted from the final statement. The Union for Democratic Action, incidentally, is the subject of extensive discussion in the Special Report on Subversive Activities Aimed at Destroying Our Representative Form of Government, of the House Un-American Activities Committee—Report No. 2277, June 25, 1942—which lists affiliations of 50 leaders of the UDA with the agencies and fronts of the Communist Party.

Seventh, the policy statement, as

finally adopted, calls for the editorial content of the AEF's magazine, *Progressive Education*, to be "explicitly geared to these purposes." Furthermore, it states that the magazine "should give much more consideration to fundamental analysis of social, economic, political, scientific, esthetic and philosophical issues arising from them, and it should assist teachers in putting AEF purposes and methods to work by providing actual materials and examples of where and how it is being done."

Eighth. This AEF policy statement, setting forth the postwar program and objectives of this movement, emphasizes that even the traditional educational objectives of the progressive education movement must be subordinated to the task of social reconstruction. The statement as finally adopted, concludes as follows:

In making these important recommendations, the AEF will continue to support the kind of experimentation for which it is most famous. It will continue to emphasize "learning by doing," "community schools," "the integrating curriculum," "teacher-pupil planning," "child development," and other objectives of progressive education as these now become more widely accepted. These types of experimentation should emphasize the social-emotional development of children and adolescents, and parent education.

In terms of organizational imperatives, however, such objectives are now subordinate, even while indispensable, to the larger, more audacious and magnetic objectives impelled by a world in crisis. Faced by the alternatives of economic chaos and atomic war, on the one hand, of world-wide plenty and enforceable international order, on the other hand, the AEF should become the clearest, most purposeful educational spokesman for the second of these alternatives. Thus, and only thus, can it become even more the great vanguard influence which it has been for nearly three decades—an influence which, as before, is certain to extend far beyond its own membership and even its own country.

Social reconstruction and "world-saving" obviously still are to have top priority rating in the program of progressive education—a rating even above that of the less audacious and magnetic objectives of routine education.

And it is equally obvious that the progressive education leadership still claims, and expects to exercise, immense influence in more conservative educational ranks, despite the embarrassed efforts of some present-day leaders of

educational officialdom to disprove the existence of the educational Peck's Bad Boy by denying or ignoring that existence.

The new strategy of the progressive education movement is that of guarded caution and carefully phrased euphemism, which, especially for the "outsider," obscures meanings and befuddles issues.

Of course, this is not characteristic only of the spokesmen of progressive education. Consider these statements from *Schools for a New World*, the twenty-fifth yearbook of the American Association of School Administrators, issued in February 1947:

The supreme problem of our society in our day, then, is the retention of the essence of our liberties—freedom of education, opportunity, choice of career, suffrage, speech, press, and assembly—while creating and establishing the controls of a democratic social order in which individual lives merge in a supreme entity of purpose and being that in itself is the ultimate goal. That means, inevitably, a vast stepping-up of the functions of government on all levels; it means a vastly increased emphasis in our schools upon education for civic and economic understanding and competence; it means a fundamental shift in emphasis throughout our whole educational program, from helping to educate the individual in his own right to become a valuable member of society to the preparation of the individual for the realization of his best self in the higher loyalty of serving the basic ideals and aims of our society.

* * * The realities of the world in which we now live endows "community" with a new meaning. It can no longer be merely "a body of people living under the same general conditions" (dictionary definition). If our civilization endures, it will be because community becomes both a primary and an ultimate functional entity—an end in itself (pp. 43-44).

Dr. Counts and others said all that 20 years ago—said it much more clearly and forthrightly.

Even more recent comments of advocates of social reconstruction through the schools disclose the persistence of the basic premises first set forth 20 years ago.

Thus we find Kenneth D. Benne, professor of education at the University of Illinois, interpreting the role of the public school educator as that of social reconstruction in terms unmatched by Dr. Counts for complete frankness:

The central counsel of this number of *Progressive Education* to teachers and

school administrators is that they come to see themselves as social engineers * * * They must equip themselves as "change agents."

The engineering of change must be anti-individualistic, yet provide for the establishment of appropriate areas of privacy and for the development of persons as creative units of influence in our society * * *

Individualism today tends to threaten rather than to promote the values of individuality. We are brought back to the processes of planned social change and to the formulation of an adequate methodology of social engineering as a necessary condition for the conservation and extension of democratic values. (May 1949 *Progressive Education*.)

This view holds that teachers are not only to be "social engineers," and "change agents," but that they must take a lead in the "development of skills necessary for creating common public judgments" which will have a priority over "unchecked private judgment." Educators are to help "groups and organizations to define and redefine those areas of life in which common values and standards are necessary." Educators are to take a lead in "inducing, directing, and stabilizing changes in persons, groups and organizations." Certainly that is acceptance with a vengeance of Dr. Counts' advice to teachers to "deliberately reach for power."

That the program of social reconstruction is still viewed in terms of collectivism is reaffirmed by Dr. John L. Childs as recently as February 1950. Writing in the *Progressive Education* magazine of that date, Dr. Childs asserts:

The fundamental interests of teachers as teachers are not restricted to the effort to get an adequate material and spiritual support for the public school. Teachers are also concerned with the effort to organize and maintain a society that can make a productive use of the human product of the schools. * * *

* * * We must develop a more sensitive regard for the cultural aspects of human existence, and be prepared to support a vastly extended program of community services. This, in turn, means frank commitment to the "welfare state," and to the planned organization of the productive enterprises of our country. The real issue is no longer one of social and economic planning versus an individualistic system of laissez-faire; it is rather one of what forces are to do the planning, by what means are controls to be exercised, and for what purposes. In sum, a functional education must now be associated with the task of the achievement of a more functional society, and teachers interested in democracy have a basic stake in the

development of this functional society (p. 118).

Doctor Childs sums up the current attitudes of American educators in three categories: First, those who believe in the Communist solution of the problems, which group, he believes, "fortunately are very few," second, "a numerically large group" who feel that "resolution of social, economic and political problems" is not properly the responsibility of educators as educators but who believe they are justified in pressure tactics to secure greater support for the schools; third, a third group, with which he identifies progressive educators. He continues:

This third group * * * believes that in the long run both the material and the spiritual interests of public education depend upon the achievement of a reorganization of our economy. They therefore do not have faith in a policy that insists on teachers working separately as a mere educational pressure group, and which discourages from uniting with other functional groups in a common effort to develop an economy in which production will be co-operatively planned for the welfare of all * * * a more socialized economy (p. 120).

Dr. Childs believes that educators, by identifying themselves with groups "which are uniting to support the social, economic, and political developments which Americans have chosen to describe as the 'welfare state,' will be taking the step most needed to preclude a Fascist development in our country"—page 120.

Finally, Dr. Brameld in his recent book, "Ends and Means in Education," 1950, defines this concept of education with the apt term, "Reconstructionism."

This educational philosophy—

He asserts—

would attempt to build the widest possible consensus about the supreme aims which should govern mankind in the reconstruction of world culture. The world of the future should be a world which the common man rules not merely in theory, but in fact. It should be a world in which the technological potentialities already clearly discernible are released for the creation of health, abundance, security for the great masses of every color, every creed, every nationality. It should be a world in which national sovereignty is utterly subordinated to international authority. * * *

Education sufficiently dedicated to this purpose no longer remains, to be sure, on the fence of intellectual "impartiality" (pp. 17-18).

Further, Dr. Brameld declares:

The kind of education here being discussed encourages students, teachers, and all mem-

bers of the community not merely to study knowledge and problems considered crucial to our period of culture, but to make up their minds about promising solutions, and then to act concertedly (p. 86).

The new terminology actually emphasizes and reaffirms the basic premises of the original social-reconstruction-through-the-schools movement, rather than altering or abandoning these premises.

XIII. "I PLEDGE ALLEGIANCE TO" WORLD GOVERNMENT

As the policy statement of the AEF discloses, a major addition has been made to the program of social reconstruction through the schools. One of the "two great constructive purposes" which have "first claim for active support" in the public schools, according to this pronouncement, is "the establishment of a genuine world order, an order in which national sovereignty is subordinate to world authority in all crucial interests affecting peace and security; an order therefore in which all weapons of war and police forces are finally under that authority."

Dr. Brameld, in his "Ends and Means in Education," 1950, states it even more bluntly, though with a word of reproach that dedication to this ideal is not more complete:

There is widespread, if still superficial, acceptance among teachers of the belief that national sovereignty must go (p. 125).

This advocacy of a supernational sovereignty particularly welcomes an opportunity to promote supergovernment in the field of education, through UNESCO. Thus, Dr. Brameld writes:

The majority machinery of the United Nations, UNESCO, or any similar organizations created on behalf of world order should be so greatly strengthened that no member country, including the Soviet Union and its satellites, can conceivably refuse to abide by its own power-backed decision (ibid, p. 117).

The potentialities of UNESCO are similarly emphasized by I. L. Kandel, of Teachers College, Columbia University, writing in the April 1946 NEA Journal:

Nations that become members of UNESCO accordingly assume an obligation to revise textbooks used in their schools. The International Organization for Intellectual Cooperation sought to promote the revision of textbooks. * * *

For the present there is no provision for the scrutiny of textbooks in the UNESCO constitution on the assumption

that they are matters within the domestic jurisdiction of the member nations in which the organization is prohibited from intervening. Under these conditions, each member nation, if it is to carry out the obligations of its membership, has a duty to see to it that nothing in its curriculum, courses of study, and textbooks, is contrary to UNESCO's aims. This task has already been undertaken through voluntary activities in the United States in the study of textbooks dealing with Latin American countries and Canada.

Recent history has shown, however, that unilateral efforts to revise the materials of instruction are futile. The poison of aggressive nationalism injected into children's minds is as dangerous for world stability as the manufacture of armaments. In one, as in the other, supervision of some kind by an international agency is urgent (pp. 175 ff.).

Implications of this proposal become even more ominous when read in conjunction with the following extracts from volume V of the UNESCO pamphlet series "Toward World Understanding." This volume, "In the Classroom with Children Under 13 Years of Age," 1949, says:

School textbooks have, as a rule, been written with so little objectivity and integrity that history, as generally taught up to now, has been an obstacle to international understanding. The child has been led to conclude that perfidy and oppression are always and solely the characteristics of the enemy. The need is urgent for a general revision of textbooks, both national and general (p. 16).

The pamphlet continues:

This revision, another task worthy of UNESCO, should carry much further the elimination of events which, from the world-education point of view, have no value, such as the endless catalogs of wars. It is not to these accidents which have periodically jeopardized and distracted civilization that the child's attention should be drawn, but to the constructive activities which help to advance civilization, materially and spiritually * * *. History must cease to be a military history and must become the history of civilization.

There is need above all for universal history. Just as the child must grow used to considering the earth as his habitat, so he must learn to consider the whole of humanity as the fatherland in whose service the particular fatherlands, his own and all others, are enrolled (p. 16).

The pamphlet deplores the fact that "before the child enters school his mind has already been profoundly marked, and often injuriously, by earlier influences"—page 7. Among these "injuriously influences" are "errors of home train-

ing"—page 9—and the fact that "it is most frequently in the family that the children are infected with nationalism"—page 54. In the same vein, it points out:

As long as the child breathes the poisoned air of nationalism, education in world-mindedness can produce only rather precarious results. As we have pointed out, it is frequently the family that infects the child with extreme nationalism. The school should therefore use the means described earlier to combat family attitudes that favor jingoism (p. 58).

The pamphlet, which is a group report on a UNESCO seminar conducted in Lausanne, Switzerland, concludes:

Education for world-mindedness * * * is a political problem even more than an educational one, and the present position of the teachers does not, in general, permit them to intervene in the field of politics with requisite authority. * * *

We expressed the wish that UNESCO would persuade not only governments, but also public opinion, that the most urgent problem in the political field is the educational one, and, more particularly, that an intellectual and moral attitude favorable to international understanding and cooperation (which is civilization's only hope) can be promoted only by a school reorganized to this end and equipped with everything that is indispensable to its effort; that, consequently, the cost of such an enlightened education is a wise investment of the national income; and that activity of the school cannot bring about the desired result unless, repudiating every form of nationalism, the policy of the nation itself is one of international understanding and cooperation (p. 60).

Practical implications for American education of this new internationalism are revealed with disconcerting frankness in the Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education, vol. III, page 48:

The role which education will play officially must be conditioned essentially by policies established by the State Department in this country, and by ministries of foreign affairs in other countries. Higher education must play a very important part in carrying out in this country the program developed by the UNESCO and in influencing that program by studies and reports bearing upon international relations. * * * The United States Office of Education must be prepared to work effectively with the State Department and with the UNESCO.

It is interesting, in this connection, to read the view advocated by Lewis Mumford, for a number of years on the Committee on Teacher Education of the

American Council on Education. In an address at a Conference on World Order in Rochester, N. Y., November 13, 1951, Dr. Mumford urged adoption by this country of a "universal policy" which "would offer" to the rest of the world "practical cooperation and tangible wealth and welfare."

Such an offer, Dr. Mumford holds, "would be hard to resist, all the more because we ourselves, as the wealthiest nation in the world, would by the very principles we uphold, have to pay the largest tax and receive the smallest amount of tangible benefits." That, of course, would be a super-Marshall plan.

The program of social reconstruction through the schools becomes something indeed to contemplate if and when American teachers become the handmaidens of the welfare state in America and, in addition, of a world welfare state with America picking up the check.

XIV. A SUMMING UP

Responsible public criticism of the schools is an American right and duty. It is the only way of progress and improvement. It is the only safeguard against unhealthy, harmful, and subversive developments.

Responsible criticism will inevitably include, from time to time, criticism of the type which some educators and some members of educational officialdom dislike and resent and, therefore, brand as "destructive."

Notable recognition has recently been given these elementary principles in the State of Michigan. The State superintendent of public instruction, Dr. Lee Thurston, has created a commission on educational policies which includes in its membership both professional educators and representatives of the lay public. This commission has undertaken to appraise public criticism of the schools, to encourage responsiveness on the part of educators to legitimate criticism, and to establish greater mutual understanding between school leaders and the public they serve.

In a communication to the school administrators of Michigan, the Commission has said:

In our American way, the supreme judge of the merits of the public school is the people. In the last analysis they pronounce the verdict.

I cannot commend too strongly this undertaking, or the spirit reflected in

this statement. It has a direct relevancy to the movement here documented.

Insofar as there is a movement within public education circles to convert the schools into an agency of social reconstruction, into promoters of collectivism, socialism or the welfare state, the American people have a right to be aware of that fact and to have full information regarding that movement.

They have a right, furthermore, to criticize the movement, to oppose it, to brand it as "subversive," and to hold educational leadership and members of the teaching profession strictly to account for it.

To deny these propositions is to deny the people the right and duty to "pronounce the verdict" on their own schools. To hold that the American citizen lacks the right to criticize, on the grounds that he does not possess sufficient "educational competence," is to say he lacks the competence of citizenship and the competence to pass judgment on what he desires either his society or his schools to be. I cannot think of any more undemocratic premise than that.

One of the current alibis for this social-reconstruction-through-the-schools movement deserves passing note. In his book, "This Happened in Pasadena," (1951) David Hulburd comments on the criticism offered during the Pasadena controversy that Dr. Kilpatrick and other Dewey disciples "advanced, especially in their written works, many radical political and economic theories." Of this Mr. Hulburd says:

It might be remembered, however, that these radical theories had been advanced in the thirties, when it was not uncommon for genuine liberals to espouse points of view which they no longer hold (p. 53).

The record documented herein has clearly established that the basic points of view espoused in the thirties are still espoused by the leaders and disciples of this movement. These points of view are reaffirmed in the AEF Statement of Policy, in the writings of numerous progressive educators, and in modified form in the publications of the American Association of School Administrators.

As recently as early 1951, Kenneth D. Benne in his presidential address at the National Conference of the American Education Fellowship in Philadelphia, was urging a new "Call to the Teachers of the Nation." Such a call, he said, "must have many elements in common with its

forerunner of 1933"—Progressive Education, April 1951, page 195. And Dr. Benne pointed out that "the way of thinking which the—original—call represented was never absent after 1933 from the thinking and activities of organized progressive education." He even credited this "way of thinking" with influencing the National Education Association "to somewhat similar though more cautious conclusions."

The record does not bear out the effort of Hulburt to dismiss thus casually the "radical theories" of educators—and of this movement—in the thirties as "points of view which they no longer hold." The movement, as we have seen, persists, regardless of any changes of views on the part of some individuals.

Even if there are individual advocates of these theories who have subsequently abandoned these views, that fact would provide the strongest possible indictment of the proposal to promote social reconstruction through the classroom. A procedure can scarcely be dignified with the name "education" if it involves promoting certain theories among students which the advocates of those theories later casually discard. On such a basis, the schools would become merely the mirrors of the prevailing fads of so-called "liberals."

Educational officialdom and its spokesmen do the public schools a grave disservice by attempting to deny the record of the movement which is documented here. They perform an even graver disservice by attempting to suppress or "punish" discussion or criticism of this movement. A blanket denial is as unwarranted, and is as certain to create suspicion of the schools, as a blanket indictment of the schools.

I have endeavored throughout this documentation to avoid not only a blanket indictment of the schools but any resort to emotionalized denunciation. I have endeavored to describe and define a movement which, I believe, is subversive both of American principles and of sound education.

I believe that such a documentation will be welcomed not only by thoughtful American laymen, but by countless teachers and educators, who are concerned about certain trends in American life and education.

Out of the experience of assembling this documentation has come the conviction that the American educational

system, like America itself, despite its shortcomings and vagaries, carries within itself the seeds of self-correction and improvement. It is my firm conviction and deep faith that responsible criticism within and outside the professional educational circles constitutes a logical and effective partnership in the continuing task of achieving better schools and better education.

I should like to emphasize one fact, which by the very nature of this documentation, has received scant recognition—the fact that the movement which I have here described has today, and from the very outset has had, outspoken and vigorous opponents within the educational profession. Present-day lay critics of this movement may take heart from this fact, for it is proof that their hostility to the movement does not arise solely from their "incompetence in educational matters" and it is assurance that they have powerful allies within the educational profession itself.

Immediately following Dr. Counts' historic address at the Baltimore convention, a Short Hills, N. J., teacher, Ellen Windom Warren Geer raised these penetrating questions to which no effective answers have been supplied in the 20 years since:

Shall we indoctrinate (young people) with social theories which seem sound to us today, but which, by the time our children are able to accomplish anything for their furtherance, may be hopelessly outdated, and the adherence to which will have incapacitated them for open-minded recognition of that fact? Or is there a higher courage in remaining faithful to the hitherto untried experiment of developing a courageous open-mindedness in the belief that so equipped, the new generation may be able, after they leave us, to cope with a changing civilization, only dimly foreseen by us, with far more wisdom than we can hope to attain ourselves? What course is truly "progressive?" (Progressive Education, April 1932, pp. 265 ff.)

Then there is the judgment offered by the distinguished American historian, James Truslow Adams, commenting on the "Call to the Teachers of the Nation":

I do not see that the teachers of America have any right to set up as a "powerful organization," free from all influence outside—except for being guaranteed tenure and adequate compensation by the economic order which otherwise they are free to flout—to say precisely what the future society must be and to train the youth of the Nation to believe solely in the teachers' utopia.

My experience with graduates of the public schools is that they have never been taught to use their minds or to learn the use of intellectual tools. It seems to me that there is a task calling for all the abilities of such teachers as we yet have, rather than shattering this world to bits to mold it nearer to the Teachers' Union's desire—even if the union could agree on a desire. (*Progressive Education*, October 1933, pp. 303-314.)

There is also the warning of John L. Tildsley, associate superintendent of the New York City public schools, offered in 1938, against the "seeming indifference" of the Frontier Thinkers "to the steady deterioration in an ever accelerated degree in the quality of public elementary and secondary education in this country."

And Dr. Tildsley offered the further counsel that—

The supreme need of America today is neither an immediate democratic collectivist society nor more complete academic freedom. It is the creation of a highly intelligent, social minded, self-disciplined, efficient body of citizens and a supply of thoroughly trained, courageous, strong-willed, potential leaders and administrators. (*Social Frontier*, IV: 319-322.)

There is the sober counsel offered by President Orville C. Pratt of the National Education Association in the *NEA Journal* of November 1936—page 238:

Should we * * * not emphasize both sides of academic freedom? The issue of loyalty oaths would have made less headway if, in connection with the statement of our right of academic freedom, we had at the same time clearly and emphatically stated our duty to be absolutely loyal and to inculcate American ideals.

As a result of neglecting to state the duty side of academic freedom, we find ourselves now in the position of being regarded in some quarters with suspicion. We know that the suspicion has no foundation in fact and we resent it. Under these circumstances what we ought to do is to assure the public that the teachers of America are overwhelmingly and intensely patriotic. By all means, let us insist on our rights, but let us be no less zealous in acknowledging and performing our duties.

There is the penetrating criticism of the AEF policy presented by two directors of that organization in 1948, Lester B. Hall, superintendent of schools of Highland Park, Ill., and Harold G. Shane, AEF vice president, and superintendent of schools of Winnetka, Ill.

In their criticism of this policy declaration, they wrote:

It appears from study that a particular doctrine or body of dogma has been established, which presumably is to be accepted for implementation by members of the association. It does not seem that this acceptance of a "line" or "position" is compatible with the progressive tradition. (*Progressive Education*, April 1948, p. 110.)

Continuing, the educators point out:

In the policy * * * sharp criticism is directed at the present American economic organization, without any comparable attempt to analyze the strengths of the system. Nowhere in the document is a scholarly effort made to evaluate the strengths of a capitalistic organization, or to point to ways in which it might be improved. Instead, emphasis is placed by implication upon the strengths of a more socialized economy, which presumably has no weaknesses worthy of mention. Such a bias seems a marked and undesirable departure from the association's belief in free inquiry, full discussion, and intelligent decision in view of all pertinent facts.

This discerning criticism likewise points out that the policy statement constitutes "the tacit assumption of general approval of the direction being taken by most of the socialized states in the world today," and that "criticism of America's economic order and foreign policy in the document is not balanced by analysis of the policies of other nations, including those within the Russian orbit, whose policies are at least as much, if not more, open to question"—page 110, *ibidem*.

Finally, this criticism offers the stern warning that progressive educators "must avoid being duped by those who would use the liberal movement in American education for ends other than the orderly advancement and achievement of the ideals of free peoples"—*ibidem*, page 111.

There is the view expressed at the Barnard Forum in New York City in February of this year by Dean Francis M. Crowley, of the Fordham University College of Education:

The progressive social philosophy of education generates confusion and fosters disintegration. The school should not be used as an instrument to agitate for overthrow of existing society.

Finally, there is the discerning analysis of current "attacks" on the schools offered by Dr. Willard B. Spalding, dean of the College of Education of the University of Illinois, writing in the November 1951 *Progressive Education*. Dr.

Spalding frankly acknowledges the existence of a "cluster of stereotypes" which have developed in the minds of a growing number of Americans with respect to progressive education.

One of these clusters—

He adds—

centers around the belief that progressive education is attempting to indoctrinate boys and girls with an idea about the form and nature of our society and the government which it should have, which will erode away or destroy the type of government which we now have. * * * In this cluster, we find that progressive education is directed toward indoctrinating belief in the welfare state; that the social studies teaching is done by teachers who are opposed to the capitalistic system of free enterprise and favor socialism or some other brand of collectivism; and that progressive education is opposed to patriotism and to a belief in the fundamental principles which underlie our country.

Dr. Spalding refuses to attribute the persistence of such beliefs solely to the sponsorship of "self-seeking groups and individuals." He refuses to accept the explanation that they are "kept alive by subversive right-wing groups in order that they might strengthen their own treasuries or have some theme which they could use in their literature."

On the contrary, Dr. Spalding believes that whereas progressive education originally was concerned with "the development of the science of education," it has "somehow got off the track." He believes that dogma was substituted for scientific inquiry and adds that he "is proud to be one of many" persons who left the Progressive Education Association and the American Education Fellowship because of this trend.

With a frankness and fairness not always paralleled today by educational leaders, Dr. Spalding concludes:

Why do they (these stereotypes) persist and why are they so widespread? I submit that perhaps the major reason for this is the abandonment by the progressive education movement of its early search for a science of education. * * *

The * * * cluster of stereotypes * * * about indoctrinating a political theory, is a direct result of publications of organizations like the AEF. Few teachers do what is charged against all, but people do not read the list of members, and attribute those ideas to all teachers.

Some of us feel that the progressive education movement has been captured by a group who are more concerned with changing society than with improving the quality of instruction in the classrooms of America.

I think that change in the direction of the movement, because of this change in leadership, has been unfortunate for American education as a whole. * * *

In the long run, we can only eliminate the stereotypes about education from the American mind by eliminating the conditions which cause them.

It is inexpressibly heartening to read these words.

I believe the elimination of the conditions in the American public school described by Dr. Spalding and documented herein is a joint concern and a joint enterprise of professional educators, elected public school officials and lay citizens and organizations.

I do not look to repressive legislation, to indiscriminate denunciation, to reckless witch-hunting, or to the high-voltage emotional tactics of name-calling, to accomplish this result.

Rather, I believe that the key to the elimination of these conditions lies primarily in full exposure of these conditions to public knowledge, in fearless criticism of the movement which has created the conditions, and in increasing public cooperation between educational leadership and all interested citizens through agencies and procedures exemplified by the Michigan Commission on Educational Policies.

MAJOR SOURCE MATERIALS AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

Dare Progressive Education be Progressive? Paper by Dr. George S. Counts, delivered at Baltimore meeting of Progressive Education Association, February 1932. *Progressive Education*, April 1932, pages 257-263.

Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order? Monograph by Dr. George S. Counts, April 15, 1932, incorporating material presented in three addresses, Dare Progressive Education Be Progressive? Education Through Indoctrination, and and Culture, Social Planning, and Leadership.

A Call to the Teachers of the Nation, 1933; Committee on Social and Economic Problems of the Progressive Education Association.

Conclusions and Recommendations of the Commission on Social Studies, American Historical Association, 1934.

The Report of the Committee on Education for the New America of the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association 1934 Proceedings, NEA.



3 0112 123384221

The Social Frontier, a monthly journal published from 1934 to 1939.

Frontiers of Democracy, successor to the Social Frontier, published from 1939 to 1944.

Progressive Education, official journal of the Progressive Education Association now the American Education Fellowship, 1932-1951, inclusive.

Yearbook of the John Dewey Society, especially the First Yearbook, 1937, The Teacher and Society.

Proceedings of the National Education Association, 1932-1951 inclusive.

Yearbook of the American Association of School Administrators, especially 1947 and 1952 editions.

A New Policy for the American Education Fellowship, November 1947, and February 1948, Progressive Education.

The Soviet Challenge to America, Dr. George S. Counts, 1931.

National Education Association Journal, 1933-1951.

This Happened in Pasadena, David Hulburd, 1951.

Bulletin No. 35, National Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education, NEA, Harold Benjamin, chairman, 1951.

American Education Under Fire, Ernest O. Melby, 1951.

A New Education for a New America, Prof. Harold J. Laski, the New Republic, July 29, 1936.

American Education and the Social Struggle, Theodore Brameld, Science and Society—a Marxian Quarterly, fall, 1936.

The Great Technology, Harold Rugg, 1933.

New Schools for a New Culture, Charles M. MacConnel, Ernest O. Melby, and Christian O. Arndt.

Design for America, Theodore Brameld.

Ends and Means in Education, Theodore Brameld, 1950.

Toward World Understanding, volumes I to VII, UNESCO.

Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education, volume III.

Who Owns Your Child's Mind? John T. Flynn, Reader's Digest, October 1951.

Who's Trying To Ruin Our Schools? Arthur D. Morse, McCall's magazine, September 1951.

The Civil Rights of Conservative Men in Education, the Case of Alpheus W. Ray, superintendent of elementary schools, Roseville, Calif., brief issued by California Sons of the American Revolution, 1951.

Eighth Report, Senate Investigating Committee on Education, State of California, 1951.

Statement to Michigan School Administrators, the Michigan Commission on Educational Policies, 1951.

The Pasadena Story, National Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education of the NEA, June 1951.

School and Society, particularly October 29, 1949, Communism and Fascism in the Schools, John J. DeBoer; March 25, 1950, review of Communism and American Education, W. W. Brickman; April 22, 1950, the Politics of Scholastic Criticism, Col. George C. Reinhardt; July 22, 1950, Fear Is the Enemy, John J. DeBoer; October 14, 1950, What Is the Enemy? Col. George C. Reinhardt; January 20, 1951, the Danger of Authoritarian Attitudes in Teaching Today, Sidney Hook; February 10, 1951, Policy and Leadership of the American Education Fellowship, Frederick S. Breed; July 14, 1951, Mr. Breed and the AEF, Kenneth D. Benne, and the Scapegoat Value of American Public Education, Douglas Rush; July 21, 1951, Why Raise an Oath Umbrella? Thomas Woody; and October 27, 1951, In Defense of the Critics of Education, Hugh R. Fraser, education editor, Pathfinder magazine, and Attack and Counterattack in Education, W. W. Brickman.

Fortune, January 1952, the Social Engineers, and March 1952, Groupthink, William H. Whyte, Jr.

Investigation of Teachers Union, Local No. 555, UPWA-CIO, special subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, 1948.

Atlantic Monthly, Quackery in the Public Schools, Lynd and Case, March and May 1950.